

THE

# DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1866.

---

## ART. I.—ROME THE CIVILIZER OF NATIONS.

1. *Le Parfum de Rome.* Par LOUIS VEUILLLOT. 3me edition. Paris : Gaume Frères. 1862.
2. *Rome et la Civilisation.* Par EUGENE MAHON DE MONAGHAN. Paris : Charles Douniol. 1863.

THE useful little work which stands at the head of this article, by M. Mahon de Monaghan (whose name would, perhaps, be more correctly printed M. MacMahon de Monaghan), may be regarded as a supplement to the more important volume of the Abbé Balmez. "The study of Church history in its relations with civilization," he told us, "is still incomplete;" and the writer before us seems to have taken this as a hint, and to have conceived the laudable plan of pursuing further some of the Spanish divine's arguments, and strengthening them by new illustrations gathered from history. "*Le Parfum de Rome*" is a work of another description, but bearing on the same subject. It consists of many discursive reflections on Rome, as the residence of the Vicar of Christ, and is full of point, brilliancy, and humour.

When a Catholic, who has enjoyed the advantage of a good education, and is accustomed to habits of reflection, arrives for the first time in Rome, he is usually overwhelmed by the multitude of objects offered to his attention, and requires time to select, arrange, and analyse them. The light is too vivid, the colours are too varied, the perfume is too strong. Two thousand years, richly laden with historic events, crowd his memory; the united glories of the past and the present kindle his imagination; the sublime mysteries of religion, marvelously localized, exercise his faith; long galleries thronged with the rarest productions of art court his gaze, and a Presence peculiar to the spot, which he feels, but cannot yet define, completes his pleasing bewilderment in heart and brain. By degrees the tumult of thought subsides, and order begins to rise out of chaotic beauty. The traveller is resolved

to render his sensations precise, and he asks himself emphatically, "Whence springs the resistless charm of Rome? Wherein does the true glory of Rome consist? What is this nameless Presence that mantles all things with divinity? Where does the Shekinah reside?"

Then, more and more clearly, the voice of Rome herself is heard in reply: "This is the home of the Vicar of Christ, the throne of the Fisherman, the seat of that long line of Pontiffs who, like a chain of gold, bind our erring globe to Emmanuel's footstool. This garden is fertilized by the blood of Peter and Paul, and of thirty Popes: hence all its amazing produce; hence its exquisite fragrance and perennial bloom. These are the head-quarters of the Commander-in-Chief of the Church militant; and Christ himself is present here in the person of His Viceroy, promulgating a law above all human laws, inflexible, uniform, merciful, and strict. *He* diffuses this grateful perfume; *He* colours every object with rainbow tints; *He* sheds this dazzling light which causes Rome to shine like a gem with a myriad fascets. The Lord loveth the gates of Rome more than of old he loved the gates of Zion; He lives in the solemn utterances of His High Priest, and speaks by him as of old He spoke by the Urim and Thummim that sparkled on Aaron's breast. Here He so multiplies sacraments, that all you see becomes sacramental; and here you find, in the Father of the faithful, the most perfect representation of your Incarnate God, and the most certain pledge of His resurrection."

If the peculiar presence of Christ thus hallows Christian Rome, it cannot be matter of surprise that she also should be an enigma to the world, and have a twofold character; that she should be one thing to the eye and another to the mind; one thing to Gibbon and Goethe,\* and another thing altogether to Chateaubriand and Schlegel; that she should have her seasons of gloom and jubilee, of persecution and triumph; should require in each to be interpreted by faith; and that every page of her history should share in this double aspect. Thus Rome resembles Christ; and in this resemblance lies her glory and her strength. Other glories she has which do not directly come from Him. She had them of old before He came; the inroad of barbaric hordes, age after age, could not trample them out, and they endure abundantly to this day. These the world understands; these she extols with ceaseless praises, and sends her children from every clime in troops to do homage at their ancient shrines. The worldling, enamoured of these, exclaims,—

---

\* "Parfum de Rome," p. 7.



O Rome ! my country ! city of the soul !  
The orphans of the heart must turn to thee,  
Lone mother of dead empires.\*

But the orphan who turns to her as Byron did, remains an orphan. Rome is no mother to him, and he finds no father in the Patriarch who rules there. To the devout Catholic she is the mother of arts and sciences as truly as the Pope is the father of the Christian family. She is, and has been for eighteen hundred years, the centre of true civilization, because she is the central depository of the Faith. From her, as from a fountain, the streams of salvation have flowed through all lands, and, having the promise both of this life and that which is to come, they have indirectly produced a large amount of material well-being, and also an infinity of artistic and scientific results. Rome civilizes as Christ civilized, by sowing the seeds of civilization. She does not aim directly at material well-being; she does not any more than He teach astronomy or dynamics; she propounds no system of induction; she invents neither printing-press, steam-engines, nor telegraphs; but she so raises man above the brute, curbs his passions, improves his understanding, instils into him principles of duty, and a sense of responsibility, so hallows his ambition and kindles his desire for the good of his kind and the progress of humanity, that, under her influence, he acquires insensibly an aptitude even for the successful pursuit of physical science, such as no other teacher could impart. He looks abroad into the spacious field of nature, and finds in every star and in every drop of dew an unfathomable depth of creative design. His heart quickens the energies of his brain, and he says, smiling, "My Father made them all; He made them that I may, to the best of my feeble powers, investigate and classify them, and that He may be glorified in science as in religion." He rises to higher studies than those of physical science; he looks within, and analyzes his complex nature. He sees that human minds in the aggregate are capable of indefinite development as time goes on, and he concludes that, as the works of nature can be investigated to the glory of the Creator, so may the mind of man be developed to the glory of its Redeemer—be trained in philosophy, and exercised also in the application of science to the wants and usages of social life. Thus, to his apprehension, the links are clear which connect Rome—the centre of civilization—with matters which appear at first sight absolutely distinct from religion, with sewing-machines and

---

\* "Childe Harold," Canto iv.

electric cables, with Huyghens's undulatory theory of light, and Guthrie's researches into the relative sizes of drops and of bubbles.

But here, perhaps, we shall be met by an objection. "Science," it will be said, "surely not merely *appears*, but *is* independent of religion, as the experience of ancient and modern times will show. Still more is it independent of Papal Rome, which has always been on the alert to check its progress, condemned Bishop Virgil for teaching the existence of the antipodes, and Galileo for maintaining the heliocentric system. Egypt under the Ptolemies, Etruria and Mexico, Aristotle, Lord Bacon, and Sir Isaac Newton, alike scatter your assertion to the winds; and if any doubt on the subject could linger in the mind of any one, the late encyclical would be sufficient to disabuse him of his fond delusion."

To this we reply:—We will not allow that even in ancient times attainments in physical science were made irrespectively of religion. Without religion, man lives in a savage state akin to brutes. Natural religion, on which revealed religion is founded, exalts him in a degree, and qualifies him for intellectual pursuits. Yet, even with its assistance, so corrupt is his nature, that philosophy and science can obtain no permanent command over his passions, and his highest degrees of refinement are always succeeded by periods of degradation, and no steady advance is made. As natural religion placed the heathen in a condition somewhat favourable to the pursuit of science, so revealed religion, or, in other words, Roman Catholicism, did the like more completely, in consequence of its divine origin and perfect adaptation to the needs of mankind. It brought society step by step out of a state of semi-barbarism, and overcame the resistance offered to its social improvements by the Roman people and Emperors, by Huns and Vandals, by Islamism, Iconoclasts, and Feudalism. It covered Europe with seats of learning, and kindled the student's lamp in the monastic recesses of deep valleys and vast forests. It created a body of theological science, and of philosophical in connection with it, which the more profound even of infidel thinkers admit to have been among the most marvellous products of the human mind; and this scientific system—over and above its higher purposes—was the very best intellectual training possible under the circumstances of the period. Then, as time went on, religion accepted gratefully and employed in its own service the art of printing, and prepared the human mind for those most energetic thoughts and often misdirected efforts which have been made, from the fifteenth century downwards, for the

discovery of physical truth. It is, therefore, manifest to all whose thoughts reach below the surface of things, that the services which Lord Bacon rendered to philosophy and Newton to science, were indirectly due to the Catholic Church.

Rome, the central civilizer of society, exerts an influence far beyond her visible domain. The earth is hers, and the fulness thereof. Whatsoever things are true and holy in faith and morals among her truants, whatever portions of her divine creed they carry away with them to build up their sects, whatever books or texts of the mutilated Scriptures they retain, whatever graces shine forth in them, and in part redeem their delinquency, are all to be ascribed to her as the primary channel of communication between earth and heaven, and all belong to her as their chartered proprietress, although they have been wrested from her hands. "There is nothing right, useful, pleasing (*jucundum*) in human society which the Roman Pontiffs have not brought into it, or have not refined and fostered (*expoliverint et foverint*) when introduced."\* Heresy is always blended with truth, and the truth is always Rome's, while the heresy is theirs who have corrupted it. Whatever is good and true in Protestantism is of Rome; and as Protestants would have no Bible but for the Councils which settled its canon, and the despised monks who transcribed it age after age, so Protestant churches would never have been founded if the great old Church had not overspread Europe. Nay, the *Novum Organon* and *Principia* would in all probability never have seen the light. Christianity, on the whole, keeps science alive; and but for the Popes, Christianity would soon vanish from the face of the earth. As far as Bacon and Newton are indebted to Christianity for their philosophy, just in so far are they indebted to Rome as its fountain-head. Whatever stress is to be laid on the fact of their being Christians, glorifies Rome indirectly as the source of civilization. It is her very greatness and her perfect system of doctrine which brings her into collision with every form of spiritual rebellion; but those who fly off from her authority are still her children, *in so far as they continue members at all of the family of God*. The prodigal son, amid all his degradation and wanderings, is yearned over by his father, and belongs to his father's house in a certain sense.

As to Rome being the enemy of physical science, it is not difficult to see the causes which have led to so extreme a misconception. She has ever protested, and that most energetically, against the prevalent tendency to give physics a

---

\* Pope Pius IX. Letter to M. Mahon de Monaghan.

supremacy over theology, where the two seem to clash ; and she has also steadfastly resisted the pretension so constantly made by physical science to thrust into a corner some higher branches of human philosophy. Her conduct in the latter case has been simply in accordance with what is now a growing conviction in the philosophical world ; while in the former case she has done nothing more than uphold as infallibly certain the doctrinal Deposit committed to her charge. But with these most reasonable qualifications, she has ever been active in stimulating the keenest physical researches. Well may the present Pope say that " it is *impudently* bruited abroad that the Catholic religion and the Roman pontificate are adverse to civilization and progress, and therefore to the happiness which may thence be expected." \* To harp upon Virgil and Galileo, proves how few and slender are the arguments which our accusers can adduce in support of their charge. If we defer to facts, and regard the entire history of Christendom, we can certainly name ten persons distinguished for physical discoveries in our own communion, for every one whom Protestantism can boast. In no Catholic country is such science discouraged, but its professors are, on the contrary, everywhere rewarded and honoured. Nowhere among us has any recent science, such as geology, been prohibited, or even combated, except by individuals. Its conclusions, when really established, have been admitted by all learned Catholics, notwithstanding they appeared at first sight to run counter to the words of Inspiration. Cardinal Wiseman's " Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion " abundantly illustrate what is here stated ; and his whole life was a refutation of the calumny with which his creed is so often assailed. New arts, which are each the visible expression of a corresponding science, have been welcomed abroad as readily as in England ; and Belgium could be traversed by steam long before the Great Western line between London and Bristol was completed. If it so happened that the greatest English astronomer, naturalist, or mathematician, were a Catholic, his co-religionists would be the most forward of all Englishmen to extol his genius. His scientific pursuits would never make him an object of suspicion with us, provided his loyalty to the Church were complete ; nor would his zeal be damped by any ecclesiastical authority, so long as his conclusions involved nothing adverse to religion. The Catholic, it is true, can never make the claims of science paramount to those of faith, but the restraint thus imposed on

---

\* Letter of Pius IX. to M. Mahon de Monaghan.

him is of the most salutary kind, and will be no real check on his liberty of thought; for science and revelation, though it may for awhile be difficult to harmonize some of their statements, must ever be found to agree strictly on closer examination.

It would be easy to mark the successive stages in European civilization by the pontificates of Popes remarkable for their energy of character and the brightness of their abilities. The average length of the reigns of the first thirty-seven was rather less than ten years; and during this time they had to struggle for something infinitely more important than art and science. They were penetrated with a deep sense of their sublime mission, and neither old age, infirmities, nor persecution, paralyzed their labours. "They employed their revenues in maintaining the poor, the sick, the infirm, the widows, orphans, and prisoners, in burying the martyrs, in erecting and embellishing oratories, in comforting and redeeming confessors and captives, and in sending aid of every description to the suffering churches of other provinces." \* Thus, in the wise order of Providence, Papal civilization began in the moral world before it extended to the intellectual. Yet in the middle of the fourth century, the Pope and his coadjutors in different quarters of the globe, presented a striking spectacle, when considered merely in their intellectual aspect. S. Damasus, the thirty-eighth Pope, occupied the See of S. Peter. While he zealously promoted ecclesiastical discipline, he won for himself general admiration by his virtues and his writings. His taste for letters carried him beyond the sphere of theological labour; he composed verses, and wrote several heroic poems.† He was the light of Rome, while S. Augustine, the brightest star that ever adorned the Catholic episcopate, shone at Hippo. S. Ambrose, at the same time, was the glory of Milan; S. Gregory taught at Nyssa; S. Gregory Nazianzen wrote in Constantinople; S. Martin evangelized the Gauls; S. Basil composed his *Moralia* and his Treatise on the study of ancient Greek authors at Cæsarea; S. Hilary and S. Paulinus bore witness to the Truth in Poitiers and Trèves; S. Jerome unfolded the sacred stores of his learning in Thrace, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Pontus; S. Cyril wrote beside his Saviour's tomb; and S. Patrick converted Ireland from the darkness of Druidic paganism.

Every faithful prelate at that period—nay, every true Christian, however humble his condition—stood out more promi-

---

\* J. Chantrel, "La Royauté Pontificale," p. 74.

† S. Jerome, "De Illustr. Eccles. Script."

nently from the mass of society than we can now imagine. Christianity has produced among us a certain general level of morality. But it was not so then. The masses were still heathen, and Christians were often in a very small minority. Their principles and conduct, therefore, were so distinct from those around them, that each attracted attention, and exerted more influence than he was aware of. Each Roman Catholic—for we joyfully accept a designation which is erroneously supposed to limit our claims—each Roman Catholic was then a light shining in a dark place, and, in his measure, an apostle of civilization. He promoted science, even though he had never heard its name, for he diminished that amount of moral depravity, on the ruins of which alone Science can build her gorgeous fanes. He was member of a Church, which, wherever it was established, protested by its institutions against the excessive indulgence of carnal affections. A celibate priesthood, societies of monks and nuns, hermits, and vows of chastity observed by persons living in the world, like S. Cecilia and S. Scholastica, and expiring in the arms of wife or husband without ever having done violence to the pure intentions which marked their bridal—these things formed a spectacle so extraordinary to the heathen, who had been accustomed to make sensual indulgence a feature in their religious solemnities, that it could not but excite inquiry, and issue in affixing a fresh stamp of divinity on the faith of Christ. What would have become of society by this time if the elements of decomposition which then existed had been allowed to work unchecked by the laws of Christian marriage, the prohibition of divorce, and lastly by monasticism—monasticism not forced on any one as a duty, but freely chosen as a privilege—a higher and purer state, best suited for communion with God and activity in His service!

In the fifth century, the efforts which had been made by Popes Innocent, Boniface, Celestine, and Sixtus III. for the conversion of the barbarians who overran the fairest portions of Europe, were continued with extraordinary perseverance by the great S. Leo. He formed the most conspicuous figure in his age. No element of greatness was wanting to his character, and the complicated miseries of the times only threw into stronger relief the energy of his mind and will. His reign, from first to last, is a chapter in the history of civilization. Attila, crossing the Jura mountains with his numerous hordes, fell upon Italy. Valentinian III. fled before him, and Leo alone had weight and courage equal to the task of interceding with the resistless devastator. On the 11th of June, 452, he set forth to meet him, and found him on the banks of



the Mincio. Rome was saved, and with it religion and the hopes of society. Three years after, Genseric with his Vandals stood before its gates; and though Leo could not this time altogether stay the destroyer, he saved the lives of the citizens, and Rome itself from being burnt. If she had not been possessed of a hidden and supernatural life, far transcending that idea of a civilizing agent which it so abundantly includes, she would already have been razed to the ground, as she was afterwards by the Ostragoths under Totila, and from neither devastation would she ever have been able to revive. At this moment she would be numbered with Nineveh and Sidon, the foxes would bark upon the Aventine as when Belisarius rode through the deserted Forum, and shepherds would fold their flocks upon the hills where S. Peter's and S. John Lateran now dazzle the eye with splendour.\*

Happily great Popes never fail. All are great in their power and influence, and almost all have been good, while from time to time Providence raises up some one also who makes an impression on his age, and is acknowledged by friends and foes alike to be gifted with those qualities which entitle him to the epithet "great." Pelagus I. supplied the Romans with provisions during a long siege, and, after the example of S. Leo, obtained from Totila some mitigation of his barbarous severities; John III. and Benedict I. ministered largely to the Italians who were dying of want, and driven from their homes by the remorseless Lombards; and writers the most adverse to the Papacy—Gibbon, Daunou,† Sismondi—testify to the disinterested benevolence of these and other pontiffs during the Church's struggle with Northern devastators. Just a century and a half had elapsed since Leo the Great's elevation, when S. Gregory ascended the Papal throne amid the people's acclamation. He was at the same time Doctor, Legislator, and Statesman; and the plain facts of his pontificate might be so related as to appear a panegyric rather than a sober history. In the midst of personal weakness and suffering, the strength of his soul and intellect were felt in every quarter of Christendom; and while he composed his *Pastoral* and his *Dialogues*, or negotiated with the Lombards in behalf of his afflicted country, news reached him frequently of the success of his missions among distant and barbarous people.‡ To one of these we owe the conversion of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers; and the results it produced extort

---

\* Monsignor Manning, "The Eternity of Rome."—*Lamp*, Nov., 1863.

† "Essai Historique," t. i.

‡ See Chantrel, "Hist. Populaire des Papes," t. v.

from Macaulay the admission that the spiritual supremacy assumed by the Pope effected more good than harm, and that the Roman Church, by uniting all men in a bond of brotherhood, and teaching all their responsibility before God, deserves to be spoken of with respect by philosophers and philanthropists.\*

Sabinian, Boniface III. and IV., John IV. and VII., Theodore, Martin, Eugene, and Benedict II., trod firmly in the steps of S. Gregory, and encouraged the clergy everywhere in repairing the evils wrought by the barbarians, and in re-establishing law and order.† The bishops became the natural chiefs of society, and the administration of justice was often placed in their hands by common consent. Their counsel was taken by untutored kings, and they gradually impressed them with a sense of the distinction between temporal and spiritual power, and of the right of the latter to control the undue exercise of the former. They raised by turns all the great questions that interest mankind, and established the independence of the intellectual world.‡ Such is the impartial testimony of writers unhappily prejudiced against the institution they applaud.

Polybius refers, in a great measure, the cause of the higher qualities and superiority of the Romans of his own times over their enemies to the custom of honouring excellence even after life. "When a man," he says, "who has been worthy of imitation departs this world, his remains are still respected; and this public institution excites the emulation of the rising as well as the existing generation." Though the canonization of saints proceeded in a divine order, and was, with all its consequences, the natural embodiment of abstract truth, it answered in a far higher degree the ends proposed in the honours paid by the heathen to their relatives long after death. It aided powerfully the progress of civilization by enlisting the sympathies of the living with all that was best and noblest among the dead, and tended to the reproduction of active benevolence and hallowed research. Therefore Rome encouraged it, and bent to her own sacred purpose the mortuary rites which, in Pagan hands, had ministered to superstition and misbelief.§ The number and lustre of Catholic saints was not diminished as time went on. The seventh century was as fruitful in great examples of piety as the second; and

\* "Hist. of England," chap. i.

† Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," chap. lxv.

‡ Guizot, "Hist. de la Civilisation en Europe." "Hist. de la Civilisation en France," t. ii.

§ See Gell's "Pompeiana," vol. i.

it may well be questioned whether the temptations that beset an era of persecution are not more to be dreaded than the seductions of sloth and self-indulgence which multiply during periods of prosperity and peace.

In their protracted conflict with Islamism, the Roman pontiffs were the champions of social improvement. It needs only to survey the opposite coasts of the Mediterranean, in order to gain some idea of the paralyzing influence which the creed of Mahomet would have exerted over human progress, if it had not been vigorously resisted. Its prevailing dogma being fatalism, and its main precept sensuality, it has, after a lapse of twelve centuries, failed to ameliorate the condition of the tribes who profess it. If, in any respects, they enjoy advantages unknown to their forefathers, these are due, not to Mahometanism, but to that very anti-Saracenic movement which the Popes headed, and which, under different conditions, they carry forward to this day. Permanent degradation was all that Islamism could promise. The Arabs alone kindled for awhile the lamp of learning, but even their subtlety and genius did not suffice to keep its flame alive. Everywhere, and with all the forces at their command, the Popes repelled its encroachments. More than once they girded on the sword, and led their warriors to the charge against the Moslem host. During a hundred and seventy years—from 1096 to 1270—they roused and united the nations again and again in the common cause. Other statesmen were unable to form extensive combinations, but *they* were often successful where diplomacy failed. In eight successive crusades, the flower of Europe's chivalry was marshalled on the Syrian plains, and if Catholic arms failed in retaining possession of the city of Jerusalem and the sepulchre of Christ, they at all events saved the cause of European civilization, and ultimately drove back the intruder from the vineyards of Spain and the gates of Vienna, and sank their proud galleys in the waves of Lepanto. When the zeal of crusaders died away, the Roman pontiffs ever tried to rekindle it, constantly rebuked the princes who made terms with the false prophet, and exhorted them to expel the conquered Saracens from their soil. Such was the policy of Clement IV., under whom, in 1268, the last crusade was set on foot.\* Two centuries later, Calixtus III. was animated with the same sentiments. He was appalled, as his predecessor had been, at the progress the Turks made in Europe after the capture of Constantinople, and made a strenuous appeal to the Catholic kingdoms against the Mus-

---

\* See his letter to the King of Arragon. Fleury, "Hist. Eccles." An. 1266.

sulman invasions. At an advanced age he preserved in his soul the fire of youth, sent preachers in every direction to rouse the slumbering zeal of the faithful, and himself equipped an army of 60,000 men, which he sent under the command of Campestran, his legate, to the help of the noble Hunyad in Hungary. Pius II. succeeded him in 1458. He was at once theologian, orator, diplomatist, canonist, historian, geographer, and poet. He struggled hard to organize a crusade against the Ottomans, formed a league to this end with Mathias Corvin, King of Hungary, pressed the King of France, the Duke of Burgundy, and the Republic of Venice into the cause, and placed himself at the head of the expedition. He was on the point of embarking at Ancona, and in sight of the Venetian galleys, waiting to transport him to the foreign shore, when fever surprised him, and he died. "No doubt," he said, "war is unsuitable to the weakness of old men, and the character of pontiffs, but when religion is ready to succumb, what can detain us? We shall be followed by our Cardinals and a large number of bishops. We shall march with our standard unfolded, and with the relics of saints, with Jesus Christ himself in the holy Eucharist." The spectacle would certainly have been grand, if Pius II. had thus appeared before the walls of Constantinople; but Providence had not willed it so.

These are but a few of the great names which lent weight to the appeal in behalf of the harassed pilgrims in Palestine, the outraged tomb of the Redeemer, and the Christian lands overrun by Saracens and Turkish hordes. To whatever causes the worldly-wise historian may attribute the overthrow of the Ottoman power in Europe, the Catholic will ascribe it without hesitation to the untiring activity of the Popes. Divided as the petty kingdoms and principalities of the West were by mutual jealousy and ceaseless warfare, they would never have been able to oppose a compact front to the advances of Islamism, if they had not been persuaded by popes and prelates, by Peter the hermit, S. Bernard, and Foulque, to lay aside their miserable disputes, and unite against the common enemy. Thus, by the crusades, immediate benefit accrued to European society, and the character of the Church as a ruler and leader was never borne in upon the minds of men with greater force than when Adhémar, the apostolic legate, put himself at the head of the Crusade under Urban II., "wore by turns the prelate's mitre and the knight's casque," and proved the model, the consoler, and the stay of the sacred expedition.\* The presence of bishops and priests among the soldiery, im-

---

\* Michaud et Poujoulat, "*Hist. des Croisades.*"

pressed on the Crusades a religious stamp favourable to the enthusiasm and piety of the combatants, and corrective of the evils which never fail to follow the camp.\* Nations learned their Christian brotherhood, which former ages had taught them to forget; minds were enlarged by travel, and prejudices were dispelled; civilizing arts were acquired even from the infidel, and brought back to Western towns and villages as the most precious spoil. As Rome had, at an earlier period, resisted the superstition and rapacity of Leo the Isaurian,† and rescued Christian art from the hands of the Image-breakers, so now she opened the way to commerce with the East, and rewarded the zeal of Catholic populations with the costly bales and rich produce of Arabia and Syria.

Having turned the feudal system to good account in its conflict with Mahometanism, the Church, with Rome for its centre, rejoiced to find that system, at the close of the struggle, considerably weakened. It had grown to maturity in a barbarous age, and was but a milder form of that slavery which had so deeply disgraced the institutions of Pagan Rome.‡ It perpetuated the distinctions of caste, and the privilege enjoyed by one family of oppressing others. It was selfishness exalted by pride—the right of the strong over the weak. It exacted forced tribute, and held in its own violent hands the moral, mental, and material well-being of its subjects. It required blind and absolute submission, and often refused to dispense justice even at this price. Immobility was its ruling principle, and there was nothing on which it frowned more darkly than amelioration and progress. In all these particulars it was at variance with the religion of Christ, and for this reason Rome never ceased to combat its manifold abuses. She strengthened everywhere the monarchic principle, which supplanted by centralization and regard to general interests the petty tyranny of feudal lords, and subjected them as well as their serfs to wholesome laws. She encouraged the municipal *régime* in which even provincial burgesses took part, and consulted for their local convenience without weakening the regal authority. She favoured the development of the influence of the commons, and could do so with the greater confidence, because she constantly insisted on those safeguards against its excessive growth which are often held of little account in modern times. Her clerks and bishops, as already mentioned, acquired magisterial power, not by usurpation, but

---

\* See Heeren, "Essai sur l'Influence des Croisades.

† "Parfum de Rome," t. i., p. 124.

‡ See "Rome under Paganism, &c.," vol. i., pp. 50-52.

by the natural course of events,\* and if the "rights of man" have been established in Europe by general consent, it is to the Church that their recognition is principally due. Political and social rights men undoubtedly have,† and wherever they have been unjustly withheld, she has aided the people in their recovery. She has brought the theocratic principle to bear on the question, and thus rescued her children from civil violence and tyranny. All honour be to her, our mighty mother, our protectrix and guide, through whom alone we enjoy spiritual, intellectual, and social freedom! The schism of the Greek Emperors tends to absolutism in its most repulsive shape, and to the suppression of all mental activity. The schism of Luther and Henry VIII., on the contrary, has tended to democracy and scepticism, while the Catholic Church, true to her fundamental principles, has uniformly evinced her desire to support the interests of the lower orders no less than those of the crown, and has promoted education among all classes, and the hallowed exercise of the understanding in every branch of art and science. She has not added a stone merely here and there to the social edifice, for she is herself its basis; she has cemented it with her tears and blood, and is the key-stone and crown of the arch.

At the close of the Crusades the nobles began to learn their proper place. Petty fiefs and small republics disappeared, and one strong and regal executive swallowed up a multitude of inferior and vexatious masteries. The barons became the support of the throne whose authority they had so long weakened, and ceased to oppress the people as they had done for ages. Cities multiplied, and rose to opulence; municipal governments flourished, acquired and conferred privileges, and afforded to the industrious abundant scope for wholesome emulation and laudable ambition. All the arts of life were brought into exercise, and a new and middling class of society was called into being. The merchants, the tradesmen, and the gentry obtained their recognized footing in the community, and numberless corporations, guilds, and militias testified to the growing importance of the burgess as distinguished from the noble and the villan.‡

Well-ordered governments on a large scale involved of necessity the cultivation of the soil. Myriads of acres which, before the Crusades, had been barren or baneful, now smiled with waving corn, or bore rich harvests of luscious grapes.

---

\* Guizot, "La Civilisation en Europe."

† See Balmez, "Protestantism and Catholicity Compared," p. 50.

‡ See Mably, "Observations sur l'Histoire de France," iii., 7.



The want of bulky transports to convey large cargoes of men and munitions to the East had caused great alteration and improvement in the construction of ships. Navigation and commerce gained fresh vigour; maritime laws and customs came to be recognized, and were reduced, about the middle of the thirteenth century, into a Manual called *Consolato del mar*.<sup>\*</sup> Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Marseilles rose to wealth and splendour; sugar and silks were manufactured; stuffs were woven and dyed; metals were wrought; architecture was diversified and improved; medicine learned many a precious rule and remedy from Arab leeches; geography corrected long-standing blunders; and poetry found a new world in which to expatiate. None of these results were unforeseen by the prescience of Rome. She knew that it was her mission to renew the face of the earth; nor, in pursuing her unwavering policy in reference to Islamism, did she ever forget that it was given her from the first to suck the breasts of the Gentiles, and to assimilate to her own system all that is rich and rare in nature, wonderful in science, beauteous in art, wise in literature, and noble in man. The Roman Church had ever been the friend and patron of those slaves whom Cato and Cicero, with all their philosophy, so heartily despised.<sup>†</sup> She did not indeed affirm that slavery was impossible under the Christian law, but she discouraged it. "At length," says Voltaire, whose testimony on such a point none will suspect, "Pope Alexander III., in 1167, declared in the name of the Council that all Christians should be (*devaient être*) exempt from slavery. This law alone ought to render his memory dear to all people, as his efforts to maintain the liberty of Italy should make his name precious to the Italians."<sup>‡</sup> Lord Macaulay has spoken frankly of the advantage to which the Catholic Church shows in some countries as contrasted with other forms of Christianity, and says it is notorious that the antipathy between the European and African races is less strong at Rio Janeiro than at Washington.<sup>§</sup> On the authority of Sir Thomas Smith, one of Elizabeth's most able counsellors, he assures us that the Catholic priests up to that time had used their most strenuous exertions to abolish serfdom. Confessors never failed to adjure the dying noble who owned serfs to free his brethren for whom Christ died. Thus the bondsman became loosened from the glebe which gave him birth; many during the Crusades left their plough in the furrow, and their cattle at the trough, and escaped

<sup>\*</sup> E. M. de Monaghan, p. 219.

<sup>†</sup> "Sur les Mœurs," ch. 83.

<sup>‡</sup> "Cic. Orat. de Harusp," Resp. xii.

<sup>§</sup> "Hist. of England," chap. i.

from service they had long detested; and many knights and lords who returned from the Holy Land emancipated their serfs of their own accord. Free hirelings took the place of hereditary bondsmen; and the peasant's life assumed a pleasant and civilized aspect. In proportion as Rome's genuine influence prevails in any country over clergy and people, the traces of the Fall diminish, and those of Paradise are restored.

The Roman Pontiffs have often been accused of interfering in the private affairs of princes. But the charge is unjust. It is part of their mission to repress all moral disorders, and especially to punish the licentiousness of sovereigns whose bad example promotes immorality among their subjects. Their jurisdiction is fully admitted; their right of granting or refusing a divorce no Catholic prince disputes any more than their right of inflicting penances in cases of adultery or incest. To deny them, therefore, the opportunity of investigating the very cases on which they must ultimately decide would be manifestly inconsistent and absurd. When Lothaire II. of Lorraine drove away from his court the virtuous Teustberghe, and accused her of disgraceful crimes, who can blame Nicholas I. for having espoused the cause of this persecuted Queen, and excommunicated in council her unjust lord? Did the Popes "interfere" in such matters otherwise than in the interests of humanity; and if they had consulted their own ease and comfort, would they not have abstained from such interference altogether? Let the world call it Papal aggression, usurpation, political scheming, or what other hard name it will, the true Christian will see in it nothing but disinterested devotion to the voice of conscience and the good of society. God himself seems to have declared in favour of Pope Nicholas in the affair alluded to; for when Louis le Germanique took up arms to avenge his brother, and marched on Rome, the Pontiff met his armies with fasting and litanies, and with no other standard than the crucifix given by the Empress Helena containing a fragment of the true cross. The victorious King was overcome by these demonstrations, and, imploring the Pope's pardon, submitted to all his conditions.\* We hesitate not to affirm that the "interference" of the Popes in temporal affairs has more than once saved Europe from Islamism, even as at the present time they are saving her from total infidelity. Whether successful or unsuccessful, they struggled with equal constancy and valour against that formidable power. About the year 876 Mussulman hordes

---

\* Milman's "Hist. of Latin Christianity."

infested the country around Rome to such an extent that at last scarcely a hamlet or a drove of oxen remained to suffer by the wide-spread disaster. Three hundred Saracen galleys menaced the mouth of the Tiber, and John VIII., deserted and betrayed by neighbouring dukes, implored by letter the aid of Charles the Bald and the Emperor Charles of Germany. Yet he failed, and that not so much through the strength of the Mahometans as through the base conduct of princes called Christian, who cast him into prison, and then drove him to find refuge in France. Often have the Popes been obliged to follow the example of John VIII., and look forth from their retirement in foreign lands on the tempest they have braved and escaped. His 320 letters show how much temporal affairs occupied his attention, because God willed that his spiritual authority should show forth its civilizing tendency in temporal intervention. His conflict with Islamism, which seemed unproductive at the time, bore fruit in after-ages.

The differences which arose and lasted so long between the Popes and the Emperors of Germany are constantly misrepresented by writers adverse to the Church. Their origin lay in the attachment of the Roman Pontiffs to principles which they can never abandon. The investiture quarrel was a long struggle of spiritual authority against imperial aggression, and the apparent compromise in which it issued left the divine prerogatives of the Holy See intact. Simony was one great plague of the Middle Ages, and but for the Popes the princes of Europe would have filled the Lord's temple with impious traffic. But for the Popes, too, many of them would have been unchecked in their proud dreams of universal empire, which, if realized, would have been as injurious to the liberties of mankind as to the free action of the Church. Frederick II., who was born in Italy, and lived to spend long years in its delicious climate, without once visiting his German domains, desired to establish in her the throne of the Cæsars. This was the secret of all his disputes with the Pope, and this ambitious project every successor of S. Peter felt bound to resist. But amid all these struggles, from Gregory VII. to Calistus II., the life of the Church was a continual child-bearing, and while the Popes battled with crowned princes, they laboured also for the souls of the poor. If you would find the inexhaustible mine of that salt which keeps the whole world from corruption, you must seek it in the hill where Paul was buried, and Peter expired on his inverted cross. Proceeding thus by regular stages in the work of improvement, the Roman Church had the satisfaction of seeing every formula of enfranchisement signed by prince

or baron in the name of religion. It was always with some Christian idea, some hope of future recompense, some recognition of the equality of all men in the sight of God, that the strong voluntarily loosened the bonds of the weak. Absurd and barbarous legislation was gradually reformed under the same influence; and trials by single combat, oaths without evidence, and passing through fire or cold water as a test of innocence, were supplanted by more rational processes. M. Guizot has pointed out the great superiority of the laws of the Visigoths over those of other barbarous people around them; and he ascribes this difference to their having been drawn up under the direction of the Councils of Toledo. They laid great stress on the examination of written documents in all trials, accepted mere affirmation on oath only as a last resource, and distinguished between the different degrees of guilt in homicide with or without premeditation, provoked or unprovoked, and the like. If M. Guizot's observation is well founded in the case of an Arian code, how much more weight would it have, if made in reference to laws framed under Catholic influence. Civilization and theology went hand in hand. Every question was considered in its theological bearing. The habits, the feelings, and the language of men continually bespoke religious ideas. Barbaric wisdom was guided by the Star of the East to Bethlehem, and matured in the school of Christ. The public penances imposed by the Church became the form to which penal inflictions were moulded by the law; the repentance of the culprit, and the fear of offending inspired in bystanders, being the twofold object kept in view. The progress made by the nations under such tutelage has been allowed by many Protestant historians, and it would be easy to cite the testimony of Robertson, Sismondi, Leibnitz, Coquerel, Ancillon,\* and De Muller,† to the truth of our statements. Duels in the Middle Ages, and even down to the time of Louis XIV., raged like an epidemic, produced deadly feuds between families, abolished all just decision of disputes, and gave the advantage to the more agile and skilful of the combatants. From 1589 to 1607 no less than 4,000 French gentlemen lost their lives in duels.‡ The genius of Sully and Richelieu was unequal to the task of crushing this twofold crime of suicide and murder. But the Church had never ceased to denounce it, and, in the Council of Trent especially, launched all her thunders against it.§ At length temporal princes were guided by her voice in this

---

\* *Tableau des Révolutions.*

† *Bell on Feudalism.*

‡ *Hist. Universelle.*

§ *Sess. xxv., c. 19.*

matter. Charles V. forbade it in his vast dominions; in Portugal it was punished with confiscation and banishment to Africa; and in Sweden it was visited with death.

The pitiless character of human legislation was exhibited for ages in the practice of refusing those who were condemned to death the privilege of confession; and it was not till the reign of Philip the Bold, in 1397, that this cruel restriction was removed. The Church had always protested against it, and her remonstrances at last prevailed. Chivalry itself owed something to her inspiration. Mingled as it was with rudeness and violence, it had also many noble elements, which religion encouraged. It was a step towards higher civilization, because it vindicated the dignity of womankind; true gallantry sprang from honest purposes and virtuous conduct, and if Sir Galahad said—

My good blade carves the casques of men,  
My tough lance thrusteth sure;

he added—

My strength is as the strength of ten,  
*Because my heart is pure.*

Sir James Stephen, in a paper on S. Gregory VII.,\* has avowed his conviction that the centralization of the ecclesiastical power did more than counterbalance the isolating tendency of feudal oligarchies. But for the intervention of the Papacy, he says, the vassal of the West and the serf of Eastern Europe would, perhaps, to this day be in the same state of social debasement, and military autocrats would occupy the place of paternal and constitutional governments. Feudal despotism strove to degrade men into wild beasts or beasts of burden, while "the despotism of Hildebrand," whether consistent or no, sought to guide the human race by moral impulses to sanctity more than human. If the Popes had abandoned the work assigned them by Providence, they would have plunged the Church and the world into hopeless bondage. St. Gregory VII. found the Papacy dependent on the Empire, and he supported it by alliances with Italian princes. He found the chair of the Apostles filled, when vacant, by the clergy and people of Rome, and he provided for less stormy elections by making the Pope eligible by a college of his own nomination. He found the Holy See in subjection to Henry, and he rescued it from his

---

\* *Edinburgh Review*, 1845.

hands. He found the secular clergy subservient to lay influence, and he rendered them free and active auxiliaries of his own authority. He found the highest dignitaries of the Church the slaves of temporal sovereigns, and he delivered them from this yoke, and bound them to the tiara. He found ecclesiastical functions and benefices the spoil and traffic of princes, and he brought them back to the control of the Sovereign Pontiff. He is justly celebrated as the reformer of the profane and licentious abuses of his time, and we owe him the praise also of having left the impress of his giant character on the history of the ages that followed. Such are the candid admissions of a Professor in the University of Cambridge. The highest eulogies of Rome are often to be found in the writings of aliens.

Up to the time of the Reformation the Roman Church was manifestly in the forefront of civilization. After that terrible revolution she was still really so, but not always manifestly. Her position was the same, but that of society had changed. It no longer accepted her laws; it cavilled at her authority, or openly spurned it. People forgot their debt of gratitude to the power which had always interfered in behalf of the oppressed, and princes jibed at the restraints which the Papacy imposed on their absolute rule. The printing-press was wrested from the Church's hands, and made the chief engine for propagating misbelief. A new and spurious civilization was set up, and was so blended with real and amazing progress in many of the sciences and the arts of life, that when the Popes opposed what was corrupt in it and of evil tendency, they often appeared adverse to what was genuine. Of this their enemies took every advantage, and constantly represented them as the mortal foes of the liberty, enlightenment, and progress of mankind. Pontiff after pontiff protested against this wilful misrepresentation, which has lasted three hundred years, and continues in full force to this day. Seldom has it been put forward more speciously than in reference to the recent Encyclical of Pius IX. We shall endeavour to show its utter falsity in the remainder of this article.

Thrown back in her efforts to evangelize Europe, the Church turned with more ardour than ever towards the other hemisphere. Already Alvarez di Cordova had planted the Cross in Congo. Idolatry vanished before it almost entirely in the African territory recently discovered, and upon its ruins rose the city of San Salvador. The ills inflicted on the Americans by the first Spanish settlers were repaired by the Benedictine Bernard di Buil, and other missionaries who trod in his steps. The Dominicans set their faces sternly against



reducing the Indians to the rank of slaves, and Father Monterino, in the church of St. Domingo, inveighed against it in the presence of the governor, with all the fervour of popular eloquence.\* The life of Bartholomew di Las Casas was one long struggle against the cupidity and cruelty of Spanish masters and in favour of Indian freedom. The labours and successes of St. Francis Xavier are too well known to require recapitulation in this place; it is more to the purpose to remark that the missionaries of Rome, from Mexico and the Philippine Islands, to Goa, Cochin-China, and Japan, everywhere exposed to adverse climate, hardship, and martyrdom, carried with them the twofold elements of civilization—religion and the arts of life. The Jesuit who started for China was provided with telescope and compass. He appeared at the court of Pekin with the urbanity of one fresh from the presence of Louis XIV., and surrounded with the insignia of science. He unrolled his maps, turned his globes, chalked out his spheres, and taught the astonished mandarins the course of the stars and the name of Him who guides them in their orbits.† Buffon,‡ Robertson, and Macaulay, have alike extolled the missionary zeal of the Jesuit fathers, and have ascribed to them, not merely the regeneration of the inward man, but the cultivation of barren lands, the building of cities, new high roads of commerce, new products, new riches and comforts for the whole human race.

In teaching barbarous nations the arts of life and the elements of scientific knowledge, the missionaries acted in perfect accordance with the spirit of the papacy and the example of the religious orders. Each of these had its appointed sphere, and each civilized mankind in its own way. The Templars, the Knights of S. John, the Teutonic knights, and half a dozen other now forgotten military orders, defended civilization with the sword; the Chartreux, the Benedictines, the Bernardines, in quiet and shady retreats, preserved from decay the precious stores of heathen antiquity, compiled the history of their several epochs, and gave themselves, under many disadvantages, to the study of natural philosophy; the Redemptorists, the Trinitarians, and the Brothers of Mercy, devoted themselves to the redemption of captives and the emancipation of slaves. Voltaire cannot pass them over without a burst of admiration, when touching on their benevolent career during six centuries.§ Some orders made

---

\* Robertson, *Hist. of America*.† *Hist. Naturelle de l'Homme*.‡ *Génie du Christianisme*.§ *Sur les Mœurs*, ch. cxx.

preaching and private instruction their special work, and among these were the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Augustines. The pulpit is the lever that raises the moral world; and it civilizes city, village, and hamlet the more effectually because its work is constant and systematic. It explains, Sunday after Sunday, and festival after festival, the sublimest and deepest of all sciences, while it guides society, with persuasive might, in the path of moral improvement. With all that social science has devised for the comfort and welfare of mankind, nothing that it has ever invented is so essentially civilizing, so dignified and lovely, so unpretending and strong, as the self-denying labours of Brothers and Sisters of Charity, sacrificing youth, beauty, prospects, tastes, and indulgence on the altar of religion, and passing their days among the lepers and the plague-stricken, the ignorant, the degraded, the squalid, and the infirm.

And of these Orders, none, be it observed, has railed against knowledge. By no rule, in any one of them, has ignorance been made a virtue and science a sin. All have admired the beauty of Knowledge—the fire on her brow—her forward countenance—her boundless domain. All have wished well to her cause, and have maintained only that she should know her place; that she is the second, not the first; that she is not Wisdom, but Wisdom's handmaid; that she is of earth, and Wisdom is of heaven; she is of the world for the Church, and Wisdom is of the Church for the world. Severed from religion, they regarded her as some wild Pallas from the brain of demons; but Science guided by a higher Hand, and moving side by side with Revelation, like the younger child, they believed to be the most beautiful spectacle the mind could contemplate.

To repeat these things in the ears of well-read Catholics, is to iterate a thrice-told tale. But there are others who need often to be reminded of facts of history which our adversaries are apt to ignore. Besides the vast body of priests and religious orders, whose office was to disseminate thought and piety through the world, the Papacy constantly sought new vehicles by which to promote science. The greater part of the universities of Europe owe their existence to this agency. Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Naples, Padua, Vienna, Upsal, Lisbon, Salamanca, Toulouse, Montpellier, Orleans, Nantes, Poitiers, and a multitude besides, were made centres of human knowledge under the patronage of the Popes, and Clement V., Gregory IX., Eugenius IV., Nicholas V., and Pius II., were among the most illustrious of their founders.

The writings of Leonardo da Vinci were not published till

a century after his death, and some of them at a still later period. They are more like revelations of physical truths vouchsafed to a single mind, than the fabric of its reasoning on any established basis. He laid down the principle of Bacon, that experiment and observation must be our chief guides in the investigation of nature. Venturi has given a most interesting list of the truths in mechanism apprehended by the genius of this light of the fifteenth century.\* He was possessed in the highest degree of the spirit of physical inquiry, and in this department of learning was truly a seer.

Let the reader transport himself in idea to the beautiful borders of the Henares, and there, in the opening of the sixteenth century, look down on the rising University of Alcalá. Let him admire and wonder at the varied energy of its founder—Ximenes, the prelate, the hermit, the warrior, and the statesman. There, in his sixty-fourth year, he laid the corner-stone of the principal college, and was often seen with the rule in hand, taking the measurement of the buildings, and encouraging the industry of the workmen. The diligence with which he framed the system of instruction to be pursued, the activity of mind he promoted among the students, the liberal foundations he made for indigent scholars and the regulation of professors' salaries, did not withdraw him from the affairs of state, or the publication of his famous Bible, the Complutensian Polyglot. When Francis the First visited Alcalá, twenty years after the university was opened, 7,000 students came forth to receive him, and by the middle of the seventeenth century the revenue bequeathed by Ximenes had increased to 42,000 ducats, and the colleges had multiplied from ten to thirty-five.† Most of the chairs were appropriated to secular studies, and Alcalá stands forward as a brilliant refutation of the calumnies against Catholic prelates as the patrons of ignorance.

The same country and epoch which produced Ximenes gave birth also to Columbus. It was neither accident nor religion, but nautical science and the intuitive vision of another hemisphere, that piloted him across the Atlantic to the West India shores. Amerigo Vespucci followed in his wake, emulous of like discoveries. He published a journal of his earlier voyages at Vicenza in 1507, and gave his name to the continent of the Western world. Thus, while two great navigators, each of them Catholics, explored new lands on the surface of our

---

\* *Essai sur les Ouvrages Physico-Mathématiques de Léonard de Vinci.* Paris. 1797. Hallam's *Literary History*, vol. i. pp. 222-5.

† Quintanilla : *Archetypo.* Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella*, ii. 326.

globe, Copernicus at the same time, and Galileo not many years after, presaged the motion of the planets round the sun, and the twofold rotation of the earth. To Galileo, indeed, far more is due. To him we owe the larger part of experimental philosophy. He first propounded the laws of gravity, the invention of the pendulum, the hydrostatic scales, the sector, a thermometer, and the telescope. With the last he made numberless observations which changed the face of astronomy. Among these, that of the satellites of Jupiter was one of the most remarkable. He came, it is true, into a certain collision with the Church, and we have urged in a recent number that throughout the conflict the Roman Congregations acted rightly and wisely. Moreover, it is truly remarkable, as we there pointed out, that all the provocation given by Galileo never reduced authority to the unjustifiable step of impeding the fullest scientific investigation of his theory. Nay, those astronomers who taught on the Copernican *hypothesis* were more favoured at Rome than their opponents. It was at Galileo's request that Urban appointed Castelli to be his own mathematician, and the letter in which the Pontiff recommended Galileo to the notice of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, after his condemnation, abounds with expressions of sincere friendship. As to the dungeon and the torture, they are simply fabulous. During the process Galileo was permitted to lodge at the Tuscan embassy instead of in the prison of the Holy Office—a favour not accorded even to princes. His sentence of imprisonment was no sooner passed, than the Pope commuted it into detention in the Villa Medici, and, after he had resided there some days, he was allowed to instal himself in the palace of his friend, Ascanio Piccolomini, Archbishop of Sienna. Subsequently he retired to his own house and the bosom of his family; for, as Nicolini's correspondence with him testifies, "his Holiness treated Galileo with unexpected and, perhaps, excessive gentleness, granting all the petitions presented in his behalf."\* These facts are surely sufficient to prove that physical science received all due honour at this period in Rome. In due time—long after Galileo's death—his theory was scientifically established; and not very long afterwards the Congregational decree was suspended by Benedict XIV. Galileo's famous dialogue was published entire at Padua in 1744 with the usual approbations; and in 1818 Pius VII. repealed the decrees in question in full consistory. What could the Church do more? It was her duty to guard the Scriptures from irreverence and unbelief,

---

\* *British Review*, 1861. Martyrdom of Galileo.

and to prohibit the advocacy of theories absolutely unproved which seemed to oppose them. To her physical science is dear, but revealed truth is infinitely dearer. Already she had opposed astrology as a remnant of paganism, and had studied the motions of the moon and planets to fix Easter and reform the Julian calendar. Already Gregory XIII. had brought the calendar which bears his name into use; and the works of Aristotle, translated into Arabic and Latin, had become the model of theological methods of disputation and treatise. S. Thomas Aquinas had written commentaries on them, and on Plato; and thus, as well as by his *Essay on Aqueducts* and that on *Hydraulic Machines*, had proved how inseparable is the alliance between sound theology and true science. "The sceptre of science," says Joseph de Maistre, "belongs to Europe only because she is Christian. She has reached this high degree of civilization and knowledge because she began with theology, because the Universities were at first schools of theology, and because all the sciences, grafted upon this divine subject, have shown forth the divine sap by immense vegetation."\*

Voltaire has observed that "the Sovereign Pontiffs have always been remarkable among princes attached to letters," and the remark is equally true as regards science and art. Silvester II. was so learned that the common people attributed his vast erudition to magic. He collected all the monuments of antiquity he could find in Germany and Italy, and delivered them into the hands of copyists in the monasteries. St. Gregory VII. conceived the design of rebuilding St. Peter's, and gathered round him all the first architects of his day. Gregory IX. interfered in behalf of the University of Paris, and, as Guillaume de Nangis says, "prevented science and learning, those treasures of salvation, from quitting the kingdom of France." Nicolas V. was a great restorer of letters, and Macaulay speaks of him as one whom every friend of science should name with respect. Sixtus IV. conferred the title of Count Palatine on the printer Jenson, to encourage the noble art, then in its infancy. Pius III. enriched Sienna with a magnificent library, and engaged Raphael and Pinturicchio to adorn it with frescoes. Paul V. endowed Rome with the most beautiful productions of sculpture and painting, with splendid fountains and enduring monuments. Urban VIII. loved all the arts, succeeded in Latin poetry, and filled his court with men of learning. Under his pontificate "the Romans," as Voltaire says, "enjoyed profound peace,

---

\* Soirées de St. Pétersbourg, Xme entretien.

and shared all the charms and glory which talent sheds on society." Benedict XIV. cultivated letters, composed poems, and patronized science. The infidel himself just mentioned paid him homage, and professed profound veneration for him, when sending him a copy of his "*Mahomet*."\* Every Pope in his turn has been a *Mæcenas*. Not one in the august line has lost sight of the interests of society and the prerogatives of mind. The useful and the beautiful were always present to their thoughts; and even in those few instances where they failed in the good personally, they encouraged in their official capacity whatsoever things are true, lovely, and of good fame.

Many names dear to science and religion occur to us in illustration of these remarks—names of men who, in the two last and in the present century, have devoted their lives to secular learning without losing their allegiance to the Catholic faith, or confounding it with other sciences which lie within human control for their extension and modification. Of these honourable names we will mention a few only by way of example, feeling sure that our readers' memory will supply them with many others. Cassini, among the astronomers, enjoyed so high a reputation at Bologna that the Senate and the Pope employed him in several scientific and political missions. Colbert invited him to Paris, where he became a member of the Academy of Science, and died at a good old age in 1712, crowned with the glory of several important discoveries, among which were those of the satellites of Saturn and the rotation of Mars and Venus. His son James followed in his footsteps, and bequeathed his name to fame. André Ampère, again, a sincere Catholic, was one of the most illustrious disciples of electro-magnetism. He developed the memorable discovery of *Ersted*, ranged over the entire field of knowledge, and acquired a lasting reputation by his "*Theory of electro-dynamic phenomena drawn from experience*." When between thirteen and fourteen years of age, he read through the twenty folio volumes of *D'Alembert* and *Diderot's Encyclopædia*, digested its contents wonderfully for a boy, and could long afterwards repeat extracts from it. But his reading was not confined to such books. A biography of *Descartes*, indeed, by *Thomas*, inspired him with his earliest enthusiasm for mathematics and natural philosophy; but his first communion also left an indelible stamp on his memory and character. The love of religion then, once and for ever, took possession of his soul, and fired him through life, like the electric currents into which he made such profound research.

---

\* Letter to Pope Benedict XIV.



When his days, which were full of trouble, came to a close at Marseilles in 1837, he told the chaplain of the college that he had discharged all his Christian duties before setting out on his journey; and when a friend began reading to him some sentences from "*The Imitation of Christ*," he said, "I know the book by heart." These were his last words.

By the lives and labours of such men the Church's mission on earth is effectually seconded. They inspire the thinking portion of society with confidence in religion, and though, from their constant engagement in secular pursuits, they frequently err in some minor point, and cling to some crotchet which ecclesiastical authority cannot sanction, yet in consideration of their loyal intentions and exemplary practices, the clergy everywhere regard them as able and honourable co-adjutors. True civilization, (observe the epithet), far from being adverse, must ever be favourable to the salvation of souls. Many writers still living, or who have recently passed away, have united happily Catholicism with science. Santarem, in his long exile, gave his mind to the history of geography and the discoveries of his Portuguese fellow-countrymen on the Western coast of Africa. Cæsar Cantù, in his historical works, uniformly defended the cause of the Popedom in Italy, and persisted in holding it forward as his country's hope. M. Capefigue, among his numerous works on French history, has included the Life of S. Vincent of Paul; and Cardinal Mai has rendered incalculable service to the study of Greek MSS. But for his diligence and sagacity, the palimpsests of the Vatican would never have yielded up their all-but obliterated treasures. Saint-Hilaire, eminent alike as a zoologist and natural philosopher, who demonstrated so clearly the unity of organic structure in the different species of animals, was destined in his youth for holy orders; but although he preferred a scientific career, he retained his affection for the clergy, and saved several of them, at the risk of his own life, during the massacres of September, in 1792. Blainville, another great naturalist, and Cuvier's successor in the chair of comparative anatomy, was deeply religious. He felt the importance of rescuing physical science from the hands of infidelity, by which it is so often perverted into an argument against revelation. Epicurus is said to have maintained that our knowledge of Deity is exactly commensurate with our knowledge of the works of nature, and to have allowed no other measure of our theology but physics. Lucretius devoted the whole of his beautiful but atheistic poem, "*De Rerum Naturâ*," to the task of proving that the soul is mortal, that religion is a cheat, and that natural causes sufficiently account

for all the phenomena of the universe. In our day the disciples of Epicurus and Lucretius are legion, but they are not always so plain-spoken as their masters. Happily they are everywhere opposed by men who recall physics to their true place, and make them a corollary of revealed truth—the science of the Creator, as Catholicism may be termed the science of the Divine Redeemer and Ruler. But useful as such labourers in the field of secular learning are, the truth cannot be too often repeated, that the vivifying principle of civilization lies in the Cross and the ministry of reconciliation, of which the Pope is the head. No man whose knees have never bent on Calvary is truly civilized. If his passions chance to be tamed, his reason is rampant, or his conscience is asleep. He has no clear perception of things divine, and his views of things earthly and human are erroneous and confused. Oh, that philosophers would learn that the glory of their intellect consists in its dutiful subordination to the Church! Then would she shine forth more conspicuously in the sight of all men as the civilizer of nations. Then, and then only, should we be able to encourage without reserve or misgiving the speculations of science and the enterprises of art, and should join with loud voices and full hearts in the ardent aspirations of the poet:—

Fly, happy happy sails, and bear the Press ;  
 Fly, happy with the mission of the Cross ;  
 Knit land to land, and blowing havenward  
 With silks, and fruits, and spices, clear of toll,  
 Enrich the markets of the golden year.

That which delays the golden year, and prevents the knitting of land to land in the bonds of religious brotherhood, is the want of unity among nations called Christian. The terrible disruptions effected under Photius, Luther, and Henry VIII., have rendered the conversion of the world for the present morally impossible. But if the East and West were again united under their lawful lord and Pope ; if Protestant sects were deprived of regal support, re-absorbed into the Catholic body, or so reduced in numerical importance as to be all but inactive and voiceless ; if the vaunted utility of association were duly exemplified ; if European populations were emulous of spiritual conquests in distant countries ; if under the guidance and control of a common idea each of them launched its missionary ships on the waters in quick succession ; if each town and university sent its quota of zeal and learning to the glorious work ; if missionaries in large numbers went forth cheered with the apostolic benediction, and on whatever shore

they might converge found other labourers in fields already white for the harvest, speaking with many tongues of one Lord, one faith, one baptism;—then would the heathen no longer be stupefied by the feeble front and incongruous claims of those who now call them to repentance, nor would infidels scoff and jeer at a religion which has been made the very symbol of disunion; unbelieving nations, astonished at the strict coincidence of testimony borne by preachers arriving from every quarter of the globe, would distrust their prophets, desert their idols, and seek admission into the one ubiquitous Fold. Then, also, the moral and intellectual energies of European prelates would no longer be engrossed by resisting aggression and weeding out disaffection nearer home, but would have leisure to organize missions on a large scale, and to fortify them with every auxiliary modern art and science can supply. The honour and glory of civilization would then be given to her to whom it belongs of right; and the nations, at length disabused of popular fallacies, would perceive that Protestantism and spurious liberty really hinder the progress they are supposed to promote.

---

## ART. II.—CATHOLICISM RESTORED IN GENEVA.

*Histoire de M. Vuarin et du Rétablissement du Catholicisme à Genève.* Par M. l'Abbé F. Martin, Miss. Ap. et M. l'Abbé Fleury. Paris : Tobra et Haton. 1862

**I**N a former article we gave a sketch of the fortunes of Catholicism in Geneva subsequently to the "Reform." We found it apparently crushed, but never extinguished, even during those long years of repression unparalleled, if not for severity, at least for systematic rigour. We rapidly noted the decline of all objective belief in the bosom of a community, whose doctrinal code had been hedged in by every legal protective measure which the craft of its founder could devise—a community which, from the fact of its political and religious basis being identical, was interested, through all those selfish motives which sway the mass of men, in the preservation, in all its integrity, of its dogmatic heritage. But the hedge which shuts out the spoiler and intruder from the garden cannot exclude the corruption which preys on the fruit's core. That fruit turned to ashes like the fabled Dead Sea apples. We beheld Protestant Geneva become a focus of infidelity, and later the hotbed of revolution, to be speedily annexed to France, at a moment when that country, under

its republican tyrants, was making war alike on the altars of God and on His servants, wheresoever its power or influence extended.

But what would have seemed to give a final blow to Catholicism in Geneva, became the source of its revival. When France was reunited to the Church by Napoleon, Geneva, her dependency, was constrained to concede to Catholicism an official position within her walls. The appointment of a Curé of Geneva became the necessary consequence of the Concordat. Who this curé was, what were his qualifications, and what the nature of the task which lay before him, our readers are already aware. We gave on the former occasion a slight portraiture of M. Vuarin, and a short account of his antecedents up to the time when he received the blessing of his bishop on the arduous charge committed to him. His career divides itself naturally into two periods—the first extending to the restoration of the republic, the second to his death. The first was the humblest and most obscure, but it was active and fruitful; it sowed the seeds of the future. The second period brought M. Vuarin on a wider stage. It drew all eyes upon him, from the important public part he was called upon to play. Both periods were full of struggles, but while those belonging to the first assumed more petty dimensions, they were not the least important.

M. Vuarin was the man for his work; if he erred, it might be presumed that it would be by an excess of firmness, and by a spirit which could not stoop even to needful compromise. It is true there are passages in his life in which we see the old man cropping up; a certain degree of human intemperance would mix occasionally with the fervour of a just zeal, but it would be unfair to his memory not to state that no one better knew how to act with cautious prudence—when to yield and bide his time. When he pushed firmness to rigid stiffness, it was because he judged that it was the only means to attain his end. Long did he endeavour to keep to a pacific line, but the obstacles he encountered gradually engaged him more and more in declared hostility. He felt himself equal to the conflict. Accepted in the first instance as a necessity, he came to love it afterwards as his proper element. It is easy to conceive how he might thus be betrayed into overstepping the bounds of due moderation upon a few occasions. A brief glance at the state in which M. Vuarin found his flock will best enable us to judge of the vast work he achieved in the space of little more than ten years, when it is spoken of as “that fair parish of Geneva, whose faith and piety made it the admiration of strangers and the consolation of its pastor.”

It took him thirty-five days to hunt out his scattered sheep, who lived dispersed in Protestant houses or public factories, and it needed both boldness and self-devotedness to go through with an undertaking which had not unfrequently to be prosecuted "amidst the jeers of heresy and unbelief, the outrages and insults of prejudice, not to say of deliberate malice and hatred." Indeed, so bitter was the animosity in some quarters, as to suggest recurrence to such expedients as covering the handles of doors through which the curé must pass with filth, or even making them red-hot. Such extreme cases were, however, rare; his dignity, self-possession, and ease of manner generally imposed upon men a certain respect, and he was often kindly and even cordially met. He returned from this pastoral campaign with a heart wrung with grief. Everywhere he had met with a state of spiritual misery that was appalling. The Catholics, exclusive of those employed in the military dépôts, numbered about 3,500. Out of 942 children, 225 were the offspring of mixed marriages, which for the most part had been unsanctioned by the Church. Almost all these last were being brought up in Protestantism. There was, indeed, no Catholic school in Geneva; the poor, therefore, either received no education at all, or such as imperilled their faith. Yet the curé was far from having discovered the whole truth with respect to the mixed marriages, as appeared from his visits in subsequent years. We need not wonder, then, that M. Vuarin ever exerted himself strenuously to oppose these unions, the scourge of Catholicism in Protestant countries, and that the all-important work of religious education was one of the very first which engaged his attention.

The character of the Catholic population in itself offered peculiar difficulties. It was continually recruited by an emigration of distressed families or individuals seeking employment, who hoped in Geneva to better their condition, a hope in which they were generally disappointed. Vice often went hand in hand with extreme misery. Weak faith, profound ignorance, and that indifference which is the frequent fruit of habitual contact with Protestants, were everywhere common, while the very destitution of these poor people laid them the more open to seduction. Thus, these inconsiderate migrations were often but the prelude to apostacy. Yet amongst the many calumnious accusations of which M. Vuarin was the object, that of encouraging the influx of these foreigners was one, and the falsehood was popularly used to incite the jealousy of the indigenous portion of his flock. Again, when by a liberal offer to contribute towards the expense of sending pauper Catholic emigrants out of the

country, he had proved the groundlessness of the charge, the magistrates took advantage of his generosity to throw the odium of the measure upon him. He had the satisfaction, in 1810, of installing some Sisters of Charity to superintend the girls' education. It had been a process of great difficulty. He hoped, in 1813, that he had accomplished a no less important object in the introduction of the Brothers of Christian Doctrine; but their appearance in the city of Calvin raised such a storm as nothing but their prompt exit could quell. An eruption of Tartar or Turkish hordes, we are told, could not have produced greater consternation than was occasioned by the sight of these few poor Brothers. Men met asking each other in a breath if they had heard the dreadful news; deputations streamed to the mayor. Was he disposed to tolerate such a scandal, he, the sworn defender of his countrys imperilled rights? To cut the matter short, the *préfet* was conjured by that functionary to send away these men, whose sole presence in Geneva was an outrage on the last three centuries of her life; he could not answer for maintaining public tranquillity in the event of a refusal.\*

This year of 1813 was one of intense anxiety to M. Vuarin. What would become of his Catholic parish when the little intolerant republic, free from all control, should have reconstituted itself on the old basis? Menaces began, indeed, to make themselves heard. The Genevese had reckoned upon the curé and his two vicars marching off with the French authorities as the allied troops entered. They were part of the foreign garrison; conquest had installed them; with enfranchisement they would vanish; and so when the last military carriage had moved off, and the determination of the priests to hold their ground could no longer be matter of doubt, loud murmurs arose, and they were followed in the streets with insults and threats. "You won't go, then, won't you?" men

\* It was not till twenty-three years later that M. Vuarin succeeded in introducing the Christian Brothers. The constitution at that time guaranteed liberty of instruction, and there was no existing law even against religious congregations. The Brothers brought passports in due form, and were, moreover, under the protection of the French embassy. People might dress as they liked in Geneva. "The Brothers," as M. Vuarin said, "wore their black robe by the same right as the Turks wore their turbans." True, the government might make a new law; but as the Council of State recoiled from so strong a measure, nothing remained but to have recourse to paltry and vexatious devices. Orders were given to close and seal the doors of the schoolroom in the roof of the church of S. Germain. M. Vuarin justly complained, alleging that the use of the whole church belonged to him. Respecting the seals of the republic, however, he coolly caused a door to be broken open close to the old one, which caused, we are told, not a little merriment in Geneva.



cried after them; "you mean to wait for us to drive you away?" Nothing less was talked of than closing S. Germain, expelling the Sisters of Charity, suppressing the schools, in fine, to quote a pleasing metaphor of one of their own ministers, "delivering the republic at last from the gnawing canker which for so many years had adhered to its sides." Geneva had not waited for the departure of the French functionaries to re-assert her freedom; but this re-assertion needed the confirmation of European assent. Accordingly, no time was lost in sending a deputation to Bâle, the head-quarters of the allies to obtain the recognition of the political independence of Geneva, its union as a canton with the Swiss confederation, and an enlargement of the dominions of the old republic. There the deputies, to their no small astonishment, met another negotiator from their country, invested, it is true, with no official character, but well able, as they knew, to deal with men and things, and likely to thwart their mission. It was the intrepid curé of Geneva come to plead for the religious interests, nay, for the very existence, of his flock with the great ones of the earth. He could not expect to gain personal access to the sovereigns; but he had secured letters of recommendation to the general-in-chief, Prince Schwartzberg, at that time manœuvring in Franche Comté. Nothing daunted, the curé followed him up through a country beset by an invading army, where the very means of locomotion were almost wholly wanting, and where, at any rate, a traveller was arrested at every step for want of a "pass." When seemingly at a complete stand, we find him making friends in the hotel at Montbeillard with a Russian pope on his way to head-quarters. The pope is charmed with his chance acquaintance, and gives him a seat in his sledge. In this company the curé passes safely in the midst of irregular troops of Cossacks, who were burning and pillaging in all directions, and extorting ransom from all they met. The amiable pope served as a protector against these half-savage bands, who, we are told, admired the priest's good looks, and stared with surprise at his cassock. From his interview with Schwartzberg, M. Vuarin returns with letters of recommendation to Prince Metternich. A favourable reception from the Austrian minister, and a promise on his part that Catholic interests at Geneva should be guaranteed by Austria, sent him back to his flock consoled and satisfied.

More, however, remained to be done than his sanguine hopes, shared at that time by so many, allowed him to expect. It was too confidently anticipated by good men that sovereigns and people, now alive to their true interests, would combine

for the restoration of those principles of religion and justice which are the sole secure basis of peace and order. But the lesson of the last five-and-twenty years had been thrown away. The Revolution, apparently vanquished, was now to take its place, under the favour of Protestantism and infidelity, in the councils of kings. Its spirit was to direct their measures, and sow far and wide and deep the seeds of fresh and worse catastrophes. Catholics were to live to deplore the work of those Great Powers in whom at that juncture they so blindly, and not unnaturally, trusted. We know now what to think of the decisions of that great Areopagus of kings, which respected rights, nationalities, and religion not a whit more than had the Republic and the Empire; which gave up whole Catholic peoples, bound hand and foot, into the power of Protestant rulers; which, in fine, seemed to have undertaken the task of consummating the work of the Treaty of Westphalia, depriving the Church of its last remaining political supports, and assuring the preponderance of Protestantism in Europe. Thus, while Genoa, Venice, Poland, Belgium, with twenty little states of Germany, all venerable Catholic nationalities, were remorselessly to be annihilated, Geneva, that microscopic state, for centuries the focus of anti-Catholic bigotry, and in recent times the cradle and nurse of the Revolution, was to be regarded with a favour which staggered even diplomacy itself, not easily moved to wonder, and made one of the French plenipotentiaries exclaim, "It would seem as if Geneva had become a *power*!" Had Geneva been a Catholic state, small chance indeed would it have had, we will not say of being aggrandized, but of being spared.

These reflections enhance M. Vuarin's merit, who during the utter silence prevailing on the interests of the Church, broken only by the Supreme Pontiff's disregarded voice, contrived to get a respectful hearing, so that, while all over Europe the rights of the Church and of Catholic consciences were shamefully sacrificed, he, the pastor of an almost imperceptible flock, succeeded in saving them in the very citadel of Protestantism. It is amusing to follow the ups and downs of the negotiation respecting the aggrandizement of Genevese territory, a point upon which this little people were themselves curiously divided, mainly from their fear of being swamped by Catholicism. At one moment they feared that the sovereigns were going to be too generous, then again things took a less auspicious turn, through the unwillingness of diplomacy to give cause of discontent to France.\* Under this influence the

\* After the hundred days and defeat at Waterloo, France, occupying a

first treaty of Paris was concluded, which assured Geneva's independence, and decided its annexation to the Swiss confederation, but gave no additional territory.

No sooner had the allied troops evacuated Geneva, than a plan was secretly debated for resuming the church of S. Germain as communal property. Austria's guarantee rendered it necessary, however, to proceed with caution; but the plot was revealed to the curé, who defeated it by an immediate visit to Paris. His communication, transmitted to the Vienna Congress, furnished one of the best arguments against the pretensions of the Genevese, supplying, as it did, proof of the insincerity of their general promises, and thus rendering palpable the necessity for substituting a precise treaty for mere verbal engagements. During this period M. Vuarin was engaged in perpetual journeyings, his object being always the same, to obtain influential friends for the cause of the Church at Geneva. In this attempt he was eminently successful. His eyes were at present turned chiefly to Turin, for it was to that quarter that the efforts of the Genevese, disappointed of obtaining any portion of French territory, were now directed. The curé found a ready hearing at the Sardinian court; but the sacrifice once resolved upon, he could not expect that diplomatists would show the same eagerness for the protection of the Catholic faith in the ceded districts which constituted his own main interest in the affair. In Mgr. Marsan, the Sardinian plenipotentiary at Vienna, he succeeded, however, in securing a warm friend, and at Turin a still more ardent protector of the Church's cause in the Comte de Sales, a worthy collateral descendant of the great S. Francis. In the able documents laid by the curé of Geneva before the Sardinian plenipotentiary, detailing the needful guarantees for the political and religious rights of the ceded districts, and which would have done credit to the most accomplished diplomatist, he made large use of an argument which the Genevese had furnished against themselves in their "*Lois Eventuelles*," published by the republic in the expectation of territorial aggrandizement. Such anticipatory legislation, it might be supposed, would have for its object to set before future contingent subjects the benefits they would derive from the projected union; but these hypothetical laws were directed to a wholly opposite end. They contained a minute detail of all the offensive precautions to be adopted against

---

more humiliated position, was no longer able to refuse concessions previously denied. Six communes were then detached from the soil of the old French monarchy and annexed to Geneva.

the new members of the Genevese family, whose share in political and administrative power, at best but niggard, was to be regulated by an entirely new standard; for it was to diminish in the exact ratio of the greater number of the annexed population. Religious rights were not more favourably regarded. 1. There was a vague, general guarantee of liberty of worship to the *new* territory. 2. The Catholic Church in Geneva was to be placed under the inspection of the Council of State. 3. The Catholic clergy were all to be subject on their nomination to the approbation of the same Council; 4, which was to use all its endeavours to have them transferred to the jurisdiction of a Swiss bishop.

To the representations and exertions of M. Vuarin we must entirely refer, under Divine Providence, those guarantees which were eventually appended to the general treaty of Vienna—guarantees which included the old territory, with certain differences. The Catholic Church in the Savoyese districts was to be protected and maintained precisely in the same state as when they were subject to Sardinia; while in the old Genevese territory it was to be maintained and recognised in its actual condition, and supported by the State. The negotiations begun at Paris in 1814, and continued at Vienna during the interval of peace, were finally terminated at Turin, in March, 1816. To estimate M. Vuarin's services we have but to compare the two different epochs. The first saw the very existence of the Church in Geneva menaced; while, in 1816, we find it legally constituted and placed under the safeguard of public European law. 16,050 Catholics were at that time added to the old Genevese family, with recognised political and religious rights; and all this was due to one man, without official character, and possessed of no power or influence but such as he derived from his own personal merit, no resources but such as he found in his own indomitable perseverance and those first-rate abilities which are the exclusive appanage of men of superior genius. Catholicism in Geneva may from this date be said to have been restored. It was the work of M. Vuarin. To maintain it, to strengthen and consolidate it, was the occupation of his remaining life, and involved a continual state of warfare.

Geneva having become a mixed canton, with one-third of her population Catholic, ought now in all justice and reason to have abandoned her pretensions to be the metropolis of an exclusive Protestantism. She had set her seal to the equality of the two confessions before the law. She had received the price of her concession, and was no longer free to pursue her old policy. But Geneva esteemed her interests, her glory, her very name,

to be identified with Protestantism. Frankly, therefore, to tolerate Catholicism seemed a kind of political suicide. It was not to be thought of, and in fact it never was thought of. The ultra party looked to the entire de-catholicization of the annexed provinces, and the absorption of the Catholic element by the incessant pressure of means in accordance with the spirit of the times, which was averse to open persecution; the more moderate expected, at any rate, to keep the Catholic Church under complete control of the State, and to carry out the programme of the "eventual laws," rather than the provisions of the protocol of Vienna. One of the most candid Protestants of the day, M. Ernest Naville, has observed that the Church from its very nature "can only be or not be," and that no attempt of the State to interfere with its dogma or its essential organization can ever succeed in modifying it; it can simply succeed in placing outside its bosom such of its members as consent to obey the State's mandates. This is a truth which Protestant governments cannot grasp; indeed, few Catholic governments would appear to have any better appreciation of it. Hence their perpetual attempts to inter-meddle with ecclesiastical matters, coupled with protestations of a desire to respect the Church's independence. Such was the line pursued by the Genevese rulers from the very first. On the other hand, the Catholic provinces had not sought the union which had been effected; they had their own political and religious rights, which they could not be expected to renounce; and if old Geneva could not subsist without invading those rights, old Geneva ought to give place to a new one. Catholics were plainly not responsible for the false position thus entailed, and for an antagonism existing in the very nature of things. The points of dissension were innumerable, but may be classed under six general heads:—Education, the observance of religious holidays, the marriage law, ecclesiastical nominations, the oath of allegiance, and the change of diocese. Each of these subjects has its separate history and its distinct conflict, in which the great curé forms the leading figure. We have only space for a few observations on the change of diocese. This had been from the first one grand object with the astute little republic. It had procured a qualifying clause to be added to that article of the Vienna protocol which declared that the annexed districts should continue to form part of the diocese of Chambéry, to this effect—"unless it were otherwise regulated by the authority of the Holy See." Rome was opposed to the desired concession, and M. Vuarin trusted that there would be no relaxation on this point, and even was looking hopefully to the

restoration ere long of the old diocese of St. Francis. But he was to meet with a bitter disappointment. Had he followed the natural promptings of his heart, he would, on the publication of the brief, "*Inter Multiplices*"—by which he and his flock ceased to form even a portion of that diocese, and were joined to Fribourg—have retired into Savoy, and abandoned a position likely to be no longer tenable. Providence itself seemed to favour his removal. The ancient bishoprics of Savoy were about to be reconstituted: who so eligible as himself to the new honours? High promotion, then as often in his career, was open to him, nay, urged on his acceptance, but he remembered his old pledge, "to remain curé of Geneva, and to die curé of Geneva." His friend, the great Count de Maistre, consoled him by representing that Popes, even in yielding, are not unfrequently leading the way to great results, unperceived by themselves, and that Rome advances by retreating. It is hard to see how Rome could have acted otherwise, under the circumstances. Geneva interested the "great powers" in her cause, to which Turin alone was opposed; but Turin, unable to contend single-handed, threw the whole responsibility on the Pope. Rome, inflexible where the essential rights of the Church are concerned, gave on that occasion one of those examples of condescension which have at times laid a heavy cross on some of her most faithful children. But was the act merely one of regrettable, though justifiable, condescension? Were the interests of religion ultimately injured or benefited by the change? We know the results of that change, and can measure the evils accruing from the Bishop of Lausanne's too compliant temper; but it is impossible for us to calculate what might have been the consequences of the continuation of the system of inflexible firmness hitherto adopted. It might have led to an open rupture with the State, and we know how little, as time went on, was to be expected from the intervention of the Catholic governments, themselves busy at the same work as Protestant Geneva—the attempt to domineer over the Church.

Nothing could present a more striking contrast than the characters of Mgr. Tobie Yenni, the Bishop of Lausanne,\* and of M. Vuarin. The one firm even to rigidity, the other condescending almost to weakness. The prelate's position amongst the discordant elements of the Helvetic Confederation had also fostered in him an excessive prudence and established him in a habit of extreme concessions. Accus-

\* The seat of the Bishop was at Fribourg, and we find the diocese generally called by that name.



tomed to move with his hands and feet in chains, any state short of such coercion seemed to him like positive freedom. He failed to perceive that although the Church will provisionally reduce herself to very lowly conditions to gain admittance where previously excluded, this is quite another thing to voluntarily despoiling herself of rights which have been legally secured to her. The disposition to trust was, moreover, predominant in him; hence a certain want of forethought and caution, a serious inconvenience in one who had to deal with the "old foxes of Geneva," as M. Vuarin was used to style them. Yet this very child-like confidence had its counter-vailing advantages. Few could have held his position for thirty years without coming to an open rupture with the State, or without sacrifice of conscience. For, be it remembered, Mgr. Yenni, compliant as he was, was immovable when he clearly saw the path of duty. His intentions were pure and his love to the Church fervent; when he erred, it was in simplicity and good faith; and so Providence seemed to take on itself the task of repairing his imprudences, partly by the course of events, but in a great measure by the unrelaxing efforts of M. Vuarin. Humanly speaking, indeed, had it not been for the great curé the sacrifices to which Mgr. Yenni consented would have rapidly led to the enslavement of the Church at Geneva. Thus these two men, whose views seldom harmonized, were in God's hands the complement of each other. If the curé might have drawn the bow too tight, the bishop would certainly have immoderately relaxed it. It is worthy of note, however, that when the tomb had closed over the intrepid champion of the faith, the prelate, hitherto deemed so feeble, appeared to have inherited a portion of his spirit; for when the government refused to sanction his choice of M. Marilley to the post of Curé of Geneva, the bishop firmly persisted in his nomination.\* Tardy justice was thus rendered to M. Vuarin's previsions, who had strenuously opposed the bishop's weak consent to consult the "reasonable wishes" of the Council of State in his ecclesiastical nominations; and so when Catholics were congratulating themselves on perceiving no resulting inconvenience, "Wait," he had said, "until it is no longer a question of little country parishes, but of Chêne, Carouge, or Geneva, the incumbents of which ought to be *norma cleri*, a pattern to the clergy." Dissensions,

---

\* Expelled by the Council of State from Geneva, M. Marilley was later to return as its bishop. The revolution was shortly to sweep away the conservative government of Geneva and, with it, the "Convention," upon which the Government founded its right of interference in ecclesiastical nominations.

indeed, arose on this subject a few years previous to M. Vuarin's death, on the occasion of the bishop's appointment of two priests to the vacant cures of Thônex and Lancy, who proved distasteful to the government.

M. Vuarin was personally and advantageously known to the Bishop of Lausanne before he became his diocesan, and Mgr. de Solle had also specially recommended him to his successor's confidence. The double aim of the Genevese Government, however, having been, 1, to isolate its Catholic subjects from Turin; 2, to place them under a more pliable bishop than Mgr. de Solle, who had consistently supported with his episcopal authority the terrible curé, so long a thorn in their sides, it may be supposed that every effort was used by the "old foxes" to create a mistrust of him in the mind of his superior, on whom they lavished at the same time the most delicate attentions and flatteries, publicly speaking of him in terms almost of veneration, calling him the "angel of peace," who was to restore harmony between the two powers. The easy good-nature of the prelate was surprised into confidence; probably also he lent a not altogether incredulous ear to their representations of M. Vuarin's domineering and intractable spirit. Certainly, the bishop, although he requested the benefit of his lights with reference to a kind of Concordat which the Genevese Government desired to enter into with him, paid no attention to the masterly paper laid before him by the curé, the contents of which might well have prompted hesitation or delay. It was decided in the bishop's council that "condescension and consideration were to be pushed to the utmost limits," and it took but one day to enter upon and conclude with the Genevese deputies a negotiation by which all seemed to be surrendered which had been so painfully won during the last few years. By the Convention of February, 1820, the nomination of the clergy was practically surrendered to a Protestant power; nay more, a kind of right of intervention in their canonical institution was admitted,\* and the formula of a very suspicious oath of allegiance accepted. Mgr. Yenni (verbally) reserved the approbation of the Sovereign Pontiff, which was in fact never given, and on one point he held firm, refusing the political *exequatur* claimed by the Government on Papal and episcopal promulgations. When pressed on this head, he made a promise, purely personal, to acquaint the council

---

\* A commissary of the Council of State (who must be always a Catholic) was to present, in its name, the newly elect to his flock. This concession was so odious to M. Vuarin, that he never after was present at an installation.

with his own mandates previous to their publication. Immediately Government passed the most stringent laws, for contravening which ecclesiastics were to become subject to the loss of half their temporalities.

Such were the first-fruits of State gratitude at Geneva, such was the first sad commentary on the Convention! "*Initia dolorum!*" exclaimed M. Vuarin, in the bitterness of his soul. He soon, however, took heart again. Things were not so bad as they appeared. Catholicism cannot be fettered by the text of laws, and where there is a faithful clergy, cherishing the love of spiritual independence, and firmly attached to the Holy See, no government can succeed in enslaving the Church. It was by M. Vuarin's influence, and, more than all, by his vivifying example, that the clergy of his adopted country had been raised to the height of their position. Of their courage and apostolic spirit they gave striking proof in the affair of the "oath," which they one and all refused to take without such a formal declaration on the part of the State as should reserve the rights of the Church. Nay, rather than tamper with their conscientious convictions, they were determined to resign their cures. The Genevese Government desired nothing better; but Rome permitted the oath to be taken, with the condition that the Government should publish the required declaration, which hitherto they had only verbally made; a condition which, be it observed, was never fulfilled.

The triumph was a slender one. The oath was taken simply as an act of obedience to Rome. The bishop was now urged by the Government to remove M. Vuarin, a request which, of course, could not be granted. It vented its ill-humour in declaring that nothing could be done for the Church at Geneva, so long as its imperious curé remained. To reward Mgr. Yenni, however, for his many concessions, the city of Calvin, in the first fervour of a gratitude which was not to endure very long, had the extraordinary benevolence to request the Holy See to add to his title of Lausanne that of Geneva. He was to reap the fruit of their solicitude on his behalf in a less pleasing form. The impertinences of the State, so affectingly friendly to him, might seem almost incredible, and extracts from the daily communications of a certain M. Schmidtmeier, who thrust himself as a sort of self-constituted vicar-general between the diocesan and his clergy, read like a comedy. The meekness of Mgr. Yenni must have been sorely proved, but the prelate had made his own position. Undoubtedly his curé was also a great trial to him, but he was a still greater trial himself to his curé. Each laid on the other a cross, which it required all the mutual esteem and all the Christian charity which they both possessed

in such perfection to enable them to bear. To one of M. Vuarin's energetic temper, the task must have been peculiarly arduous, yet nothing is more admirable than his sacerdotal obedience combined with the perfect independence of spirit which he preserved.

It was no domineering temper that actuated the conduct of the Curé of Geneva; when the Church was in peril he raised his voice, but if ever he believed that in the hastiness of zeal he had infringed the duty of filial submission, he hastened to make noble amends. As an example, when, later in the year 1835, Protestant bigotry was at its height, from the so called Evangelical re-action, and a system of aggressive proselytism was set on foot, M. Vuarin induced the clergy to present a strong memorial to the bishop on the present dangers of the Church. It elicited a furious outbreak of fanatic wrath. The bishop, whom M. Vuarin had not previously consulted, was pained and embarrassed. There was some irregularity in the proceeding, yet the curé believed he had solid reasons for this exceptional course. But he had enemies at Fribourg; amongst others a vicar-general, whose animosity on this occasion displayed itself in a letter of congratulation to a Protestant, the author of a bitter attack upon the memorial, in which the clergy, and M. Vuarin in particular, were censured without measure. M. Vuarin committed the fault of retorting on one who was his ecclesiastical superior, by such a flagellation as his pen knew well how to inflict. The authorship was veiled, not concealed, under an assumed name; and Mgr. Yenni addressed to M. Vuarin, under that same fictitious designation, a letter of deep sorrow and mild expostulation, which had its instant effect. The curé withdrew and destroyed at once the whole edition of his letter. To leave no doubt of his real sentiments, he proposed to the assembled clergy at the Synod at Fribourg, the following year, to present a declaration of affectionate attachment and submission to Mgr. Yenni; he himself drew up the formula. Yet inwardly he was not satisfied; in Mgr. Yenni's correspondence there lingered, mixed with his usual kind consideration, a certain reserve and coldness. He felt he had saddened his father's heart. It weighed upon him like remorse. "I must go to Fribourg; I want to reconcile myself to my bishop; come with me," he said to one of his vicars after the Easter of 1837. They go; M. Vuarin makes his appointment, and has his interview. The scene must have been a moving one. There was here no contest but of humility on one side and of tenderness on the other; "tears flowed which are registered in heaven, and these two venerable men fell into each other's

arms. Angels must have been touched at the sight." "It is done," said the curé, returning to his vicar with a face of radiant joy; "I fell on my knees and asked forgiveness; we embraced each other; peace is made. I am happy." From that hour the warmest friendship was added, on Mgr. Yenni's part, to the respect which he had ever entertained for M. Vuarin. They continued frequently to differ, but not a shade of coolness again interfered with the frankness of mutual confidence. Another instance of M. Vuarin's generous readiness to confess a fault is related in his intercourse with Mgr. Devie, Bishop of Belley. "My dear curé," said that holy prelate to him, in the midst of a party of ecclesiastics, "you ought sometimes to call to mind that beautiful saying of S. Francis de Sales, 'you catch more flies with a spoonful of honey than with a whole barrel of vinegar.'" "Flies, well and good, my lord, but not wasps," was the pastor of Geneva's quick reply; and he proceeded to prove, what was probably most true, that at a distance from Geneva men misjudged him, from ignorance of the circumstances. Yet he thought he had herein failed in respect to the bishop; so, a few minutes after, drawing him on one side, he fell at the feet of the prelate, confessed his error, and received forgiveness for what most persons would regard as a very slight fault.

The Revolution of 1830 struck M. Vuarin with consternation. What he had long feared proved to be no vain terror. The whole order of things which fifteen centuries of Christianity had consecrated was, indeed, doomed to destruction. The great conspiracy which for twenty years had deluged Europe with blood, had not been crushed. The last fifteen years of peace had been employed in Switzerland in mining the ground. The refugees from all parts had helped on the work. Switzerland was the volcano of Europe, a great powder magazine, wanting but a spark to explode. Our readers need not to be reminded of the triumphs of infidel radicalism in that country, and how it swept away most of those little cantonal governments which had used all their strength only to demolish the Church, the last supporting pillar of the social edifice. The great Catholic cantons did not escape; the smaller ones fared better, because they had preserved in its fulness the vigour of a conservative faith. The object of the Revolution was to substitute for the federation a central government, a great engine of oppression. In the Catholics alone did it meet with consistent opposition. Geneva sympathized with the new order of things, but this sympathy was qualified on the part of the rulers by dread of the progress of democratic revolution. The constitution was the work of the Genevese aristocracy, and they could not fail to perceive

that the Revolution aimed at the subversion of all aristocracies, republican as well as monarchical. From this period, however, the people began to clamour for political power. Piece by piece the old constitution had to be flung to them, in the hopes of saving the remainder, until, tired of waiting for the result of this gradual demolition, democracy at last burst in like a flood, and swept the whole fabric away. M. Vuarin did not live to see the full consummation of this work, but he witnessed its early progress, and showed that he knew how to be the man of his day, in the good sense of the term. Hitherto he had invoked treaties, and the protection of the court of Turin; he now changed his tactics, and henceforward relied only on the united efforts of the Catholic laity. He exerted himself to give them the consciousness of their rights, and inspire them with courage to assert them. He has been compared at this period to the O'Connell of a little Ireland. In 1836 we find him taking an active part in the elections. The exasperation of the Protestants was heightened by the attempt of the Catholics to exercise privileges which the letter of the law had for years conceded to them, but from which they were practically excluded. In the Lent of 1839 their irritation exhibited itself in acts of fanatical violence. For several days mobs, numbering two or three thousand, filled the streets, uttering threats and imprecations, and crowding all the approaches to S. Germain, to which the clergy could repair only between two hedges of gendarmes. M. Vuarin did not distress himself much about these overt acts. They were, he thought, a kind of safety-valve to Protestant bigotry, and his own people behaved admirably.

We must here say a few passing words about the "Evangelical revival" in Geneva, which, as one of its effects, brought about a recrudescence of fanatical zeal against Popery. We have spoken of the miserable state of unbelief prevailing within the Calvinistic body previous to the French Revolution. D'Alembert and Rousseau have left us a picture of the theology of the Genevese ministers. In 1814 things were no better, but rather worse. From negations to negations the descent had landed the Protestant pastors in an utter nullity of faith. There was no longer any belief in the Blessed Trinity, in the Divinity of our Lord, in original sin or redemption. A respectable kind of philosophy, with a slight Christian tincture, was the best doctrine taught. All the books of popular instruction had been modified in this sense. The corruption of morals kept pace with the abandonment of faith, and hideous revelations have been made of the habitual conduct even of the theological students. But in the midst of this mass of infi-



delity and immorality, there were some of the rising generation who were moved to indignation at the sight, and who yearned for something better, higher, and purer; young men who still frequented the churches, not for form's sake, but because they could not endure to live altogether without God and without worship. By and bye these youths united under the name of the *Société des Amis*, and were initiated by English "Evangelicals" in the methodism of Wesley and of the Moravian brethren. The movement rapidly spread; its chief promoters were the student Empeytaz,\* Bost, Guers, and the minister, Malan. Madame Krüdener was the prophetess of the "Revival." Empeytaz launched forth his pamphlet on the Divinity of Jesus Christ, which boldly taxed the degenerate successors of Calvin with Socinianism, and refuted their infidel tenets. Immense was the scandal. The multitude was now roused to the perception of the plain and naked truth, that their spiritual guides absolutely believed nothing. The Venerable Company, alarmed, prohibited preaching on the chief points of Christian theology. This new regulation raised an uproar, followed by the protestations of Guers and Malan. The former had not yet received ordination, and now saw his ecclesiastical career closed before him; the latter was excluded from his pulpit, and ultimately deposed.

M. Vuarin threw himself into the medley, and anonymously, under the fictitious character of a Protestant, opened a battery against the Socinianism of the Venerable Company. During the long and hot controversy which ensued between the Dissidents and the Establishment, the curé published, both at Geneva and in foreign journals, a considerable number of papers under the shelter of the same disguise. He was thus enabled to do battle, in a certain degree, for the cause of religion, by taking the side of the methodists, so far as they were champions and maintainers of Christian principles, and to deal hard blows at the Venerable Company. We must not suppose, however, that the methodists themselves regarded their accidental ally with any favour. On the contrary, their bitterness against Catholicism exceeded that of the State Church; and on this one ground alone were they united with it in feeling and action. The decree of prohibition against discussion issued by the Company had been the signal for the formation of a Free Church, which soon rivalled, if it did

---

\* This man had long had Catholic tendencies, was acquainted with M. Vuarin, and used to frequent S. Germain. Continually talking of the Roman Church to M. Bost, the latter exclaimed impatiently one day, "Well, go and be a Catholic at once, and have done with it!"

not surpass, the State Church in material resources, for which it was indebted to the zeal of its disciples, and, in no small measure, to the substantial aid of the English Bible Society. The Establishmentarians commonly, indeed, reproached the Dissenters with "fattening themselves on English gold;" in return the Dissenters taunted their adversaries with malversation of certain educational funds. The low pay of the Genevese pastors was made also a ground of ridicule. While the orthodox ministers (as the Methodists styled themselves) enjoyed their £300, £400, or £500 a year, the State clergy had many of them but a poor stipend of £80. "It is a hard thing," says Bost, "to be a Socinian minister, and get 2,000 francs a year in this life, and perdition in the next." But the Socinians, on their part, could also wield the weapons of sarcasm, and one of the random shots exchanged at that time in public journals, fixed upon the men of the "Revival" the nick-name of *mômiers* (mummers), which they never lost. The dissenting body of Geneva was early possessed with a furious spirit of propagandism, and soon France, Belgium, and Switzerland were infested by their ambulant missionaries, stipendiaries of English Evangelicalism, and inundated with their Bibles and tracts; but the strength and greatness of the dissident body in Geneva dates from the foundation of the church of the Oratoire, presided over by Gaussen, Galland, and Merle d'Aubigné.

It would be futile to attempt to deny that the "revival" in Geneva, which had its parallel in various degrees within all the Protestant bodies, sprang from the need which was imperatively felt of returning to the forgotten principles of Christianity. This was its good side, the side which M. Vuarin supported, in its beginnings, with his able pen; and it is but just to allow that it numbered in its ranks many sincere, upright, and even admirable persons. But looked at in its general historical results, it must be confessed that the large majority of the minds which came under its influence received little from it but a narrow spirit of bigotry and fanaticism, and that the permanent effect of the movement was to re-inoculate Protestant society with hatred of Catholicism much more thoroughly than with the germs of those Christian verities which it re-asserted. Hence it extended its hand upon occasion to every enemy of the Church and of genuine Christianity, including infidels, radicals, and revolutionists.

The Protestants of Geneva had never cordially accepted the law which placed the Reformed and the Catholic on an equal footing, and which had deprived their city of its ancient

political preponderance. Feelings of discontent worked in the breasts of the old citizens, ready to break out in open manifestations. The creation of the "Evangelical Society," in 1834, whose avowed object was to assault both the national and Catholic Churches, was the signal of the commencement of the violent Protestant reaction to which we have alluded, and which reached its climax in 1839. It was about the same time that the government began to take the most active measures for depriving the Catholics of all the little share they had hitherto enjoyed of municipal and legislative power. Legally placed by the terms of the constitution on an equality with the Protestants, they had been practically excluded, as far as possible, from all public employment, high or low. This was one of the grievances against which we find the energetic curé loudly remonstrating. "Why," he asks, "out of 28 counsellors of State are there but two Catholics? out of 1,021 employés, but 59?\*" But an attempt still more alarming to the watchful pastor was now being made; viz., to introduce Protestant worship into the Catholic cantons. Ministers and Methodists, forgetting their mutual animosity, joined in the work of distributing Protestant Bibles and tracts wholesale. But the faithful, warned by the curé and his jealous coadjutors of the wiles of the enemy, committed them to the flames, and summarily ejected the ministers who sought to intrude themselves into the country places.

In 1835 was celebrated the third jubilee of the Reform, which was characteristically ushered in with the apotheosis of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Its object was as much political as religious, and was designed to rehabilitate Calvinism and vindicate the Consistory or Venerable Company against the accusations to which they had been subjected for eighteen years. Every effort was made to get up a demonstration little short of universal. All Protestant Europe and America were convoked, but not a few of the sectarian bodies turned a deaf ear to the summons, unwilling to fraternize too closely with Socinians. The jubilee itself, however, was a splendid affair, about as unlike a Catholic jubilee, of course, as may well be conceived; but there were banquets, illuminations, fireworks, dances, and—sermons; the chief topics being the glorification of the Reform and the vituperation of Popery. So large a toleration was preached in all other directions, save that of Catholicism, that it elicited an indignant protest from an Anglican clergyman named Hartley, who had the creditable

---

\* At that time the Catholic and Protestant population were in the proportion of 18,000 to 25,000.

boldness to denounce, before a large assembly of pastors, the apostacy of the Church of Geneva. But the jubilee succeeded in one of its objects at least, that of reviving a little spirit of fanaticism against the Church; and out of it sprang the "Protestant Union," organized, as our readers well know, as a weapon of destruction against Catholicism.

Our curé, meanwhile, who knew how to make profit of every occurrence, whether prosperous or adverse, excited his people to increased fervour and devotion. Into every parish he sent a banner, bearing on one side a representation of an *ostensarium*, with these words: "My flesh is meat indeed. Take and eat, this is my Body;" and on the other a Cross, surrounded with this double motto: "In this sign you shall conquer," and "One faith, one fold, one pastor." Round this new Labarum, unfurled in each church, the Catholics rallied, while the noisy orgies of the Protestants were filling the city with their din; and at the foot of the altar they fervently renewed their solemn profession of faith and resolution to live and die for it. It was upon the weapons of faith, indeed, that M. Vuarin placed all his reliance, but he used human measures as vigorously as if his whole trust had not centered elsewhere; or, rather, it would be truer to say, he used them so vigorously, because his confidence rested on securer aid. Amongst the biting pamphlets which he published on this occasion, and which produced great effect, we may notice "The Shade of Calvin to the Venerable Company." The heresiarch is represented as issuing from the abyss or Tartarus to call it to account for its impious desertion of the Reform, in presence of the statue of Rousseau. It was quickly followed by "The Shade of Rousseau to Calvin," in which the Deist philosopher takes his revenge in well-merited invectives against the gloomy reformer. But what irritated the Protestants most, was the republication of the Lives of Calvin and Beza by Bolsec, with a cogent preface by the editor. These preliminaries of warfare were followed, on the part of the belligerent curé, by efforts to unite the clergy in a simultaneous and energetic act of resistance; the result being that address to his bishop to which we have adverted.

During the last stormy years of M. Vuarin's life he made large use of the press, appealing in numerous pamphlets to public opinion against the flagrant injustices—social, religious, and political—under which the Catholics laboured. It is to be regretted that the merit of these ephemeral publications is sometimes impaired by a too prodigal use of the weapons of sarcasm and irony, richly deserved in this case, it is true, yet seldom, in any, fruitful of good effects. The last production

of his pen, indited when the shades of death were closing round him, and addressed to M. Rigaud, a counsellor of state, is remarkable for the spirit of stern admonition in which it is written. It closes with words which read like a prophecy. He assures the Minister that the government will find itself deceived in its hope of putting down the Catholics after their curé's death. They number in Geneva 8,000 \* souls, and God, who has made use of him as a weak instrument for their protection and increase in the face of the most adverse circumstances, will know how to provide him a successor to carry on the work. He then turns to address M. Rigaud in his capacity of citizen. "Few are there," he says, "among your political acts with which the Catholics of Geneva and Switzerland have reason to be satisfied. Your conscience will tell you better than I can. Stop, sir, while yet it is time. Take, and cause the magistrates to take, a different course from that which they are now pursuing. Whither is radicalism leading our common country? The time will come when Catholics shall demand from you a severe account; you have shown them no mercy; you have not prepared them to act towards you in a spirit of gratitude. God shall judge between you and them."

The "great curé" of Geneva died in 1843, before his prediction had received its full accomplishment. His name must be for ever held in benediction in the Church he so loved and served. We have spoken chiefly of his public acts, but as the model of a pastor he furnishes one of the most shining examples on record.† He had his faults, but they were not the result of deficiency in any of those virtues which constitute the Christian character, and in which the priest, above all, ought to excel; rather were they owing to what we may call the redundancy of certain heroic qualities which are essential to a generous apostolic spirit. God

---

\* The present number of the Catholics in Geneva, according to the official tables, amounts to 21,000. Dr. Dollinger puts the Catholic population of the canton at 42,355 out of a total of 83,845 souls.—*The Church and the Churches.*

† Of the many testimonies to his merit, we will quote only three, but they are of high authority. On its being suggested to Leo XII. that M. Vuarin would make an admirable cardinal, "I make a cardinal of M. Vuarin?" he replied; "certainly not; I can find plenty of cardinals, but where shall I find another curé of Geneva?" Gregory XVI., in speaking of him, exclaimed, "Ah! he is very dear to us. His life is sublime." From our present Holy Father we have on record, while Bishop of Imola, this description of M. Vuarin:—"Of all the curés having charge of souls, with whom I am acquainted in the whole Catholic world, the Curé of Geneva is the most zealous, the most devoted, the most attached to the Church."

granted him a kind of pause between life and death, when grace seems to have given those finishing touches which remained to complete his sanctity. He, whose native element was activity, was reduced for many months to a forced cessation from labour, while retaining fully the use of his intellect. His illness was one long preparation for death. He had given well-nigh every hour of his life to God's service, but he had now to pass through a furnace in which so many of His saints have been purified—a fear of the tremendous account. Out of this ordeal he came altogether transformed. His native impetuosity had all vanished; he was sweet, docile, gentle as a lamb. So completely did he conceal his inward sufferings, that an injudicious friend seeing him one day sit inactive and silent, exhorted him to leave his arm-chair and set to work; he was not so bad as he fancied. This was meant for encouragement, which M. Vuarin never needed. He rose, and laboured with feverish energy for two days; but it was his death-blow; he sank back in complete exhaustion, from which he was never more to rally. His faculties he preserved to the last, together with his loving solicitude for all that concerned the interests of his dear flock. When a Protestant witnessed the outbreak of grief at his death, he could not forbear from exclaiming, "It is beautiful to die so beloved."

It was three years after M. Vuarin's death, in 1846, that the democratic revolution completed its work in Geneva. We are not attempting to trace the political vicissitudes of that city, nor to allude to them further than their bearing upon our immediate subject requires. To one of the ablest of those unprincipled apostles of social destruction, who have been at once its children and its propagators in our modern times, Fazy, was mainly due the credit, or rather discredit, of the achievement. The National Church, the Church of Calvin, was of course demolished by the revolutionary storm. The new constitution of 1846 necessarily entailed a reconstruction of the old ecclesiastical edifice. One of her own friends and defenders, Diodati, has confessed that this was an inevitable result. The whole principle on which it was based was now reversed. The right of election passed from the higher orders of the Church to the people: "We were a Church of the clergy," says the professor; "we are now a Church of the people."

It would have been Fazy's wish to accomplish a complete separation of Church and State. The new republic, like other new republics, ought to have no particular religion, and consequently no State Church. The result would have left Catholicism the chief national religion; physical force, if



numbers are to be taken as its criterion, being already on their side. But we know by experience how little a mere numerical predominance has availed to protect the Church from spoliation, and religion from persecution and oppression, where governments, in theory indifferent to all creeds and worships, but in practice bitterly opposed to the Catholic faith, are installed. The Catholics of Geneva were, indeed, far from desirous to aid in any radical or extreme measure, which would have issued in annulling the State guarantee which they enjoyed, and which ever since the treaty of Turin had substantially secured their rights in the Canton. The Protestants, on the other hand, dreaded the establishment of an order of things which would leave the Catholic element, already preponderant, without that legal check which the existence of a National State Church provided. Fazy's full desire was not therefore carried out, and the Church of Calvin was only reformed on a democratic basis. But it is needless to observe it was no longer even externally the Church which Calvin had created. Besides its new popular constitution, the door of admission was thrown wide open; Holy Scripture being declared the infallible rule of doctrine and morals, but full liberty given to individual private interpretation. The National Church of Geneva was declared to be "composed of all Genevese who accepted the constitution of this Church, as it was declared to be instituted." An institution which involved no confession of faith, which laid down no definite rules, and which excluded nothing and no one that could find accommodation in its breadth and vagueness, bore small resemblance to Calvin's ecclesiastical strait waistcoat. But that corporation had long before, as we have seen, lost all pretensions to any resemblance, not to Calvin's Church only, but to any community enjoying that general title to call itself Christian, which is grounded upon the witness borne to, at least, some portion of Christian truth. This throwing open of the doors, and establishing the National Church of Geneva on a broader basis, has not, therefore, as might be conceived, apart from a consideration of the peculiar circumstances of the case, had the effect of a deterioration in objective belief. This, indeed, was scarcely possible—rather, by the breaking up of the old chartered body, now fallen to the lowest grade of Socinianism, and by the working of universal suffrage applied to the election of pastors, it has given entrance once more to men holding a certain amount of Gospel truth, and to not a few zealous for what they do hold. There is little difference now in the preaching heard within the walls of many of the national and of the dissident churches. A curious paradox, however, may

be witnessed in Geneva. The "Eglise Libre," which in 1849 was consolidated by a union between the chief dissenting bodies, has an explicit confession of faith imposed as the terms of admission, while the national Establishment has none whatsoever, and includes within its comprehensive embrace every variety of Protestantism, illuminism, and rationalism. But to enter on this subject would be to travel beyond the limits of our subject.

The work of M. Vuarin has been worthily carried on by his successors at S. Germain. The Abbé Mermillod who, as Rector of Notre Dame, the new Catholic church at Geneva, is honourably mentioned in the last concluding paragraph of M. Fleury's and M. Martin's valuable work, has recently been consecrated by the Holy Father to act as coadjutor to the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, and to reside in that city. This act would, indeed, have been the consummation on earth of M. Vuarin's desires, as it is doubtless the fulfilment of his prayers in the place of his reward.

### ART. III.—CHRISTIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

*De la Richesse dans les Sociétés Chrétiennes.* Par CHARLES PERIN, Professeur de Droit Public et d'Economie Politique à l'Université de Louvain. 2 vols. 8vo. J. Lecoffre et Guillaumin. Paris : 1861.

WHILST studying the most important publications on Political Economy, which of late years have been issued either in England or on the Continent, the writer of the present article was often struck with an ever-recurring reflection that has found at last both its justification and exponent in the work we are about to review. The reflection might run as follows:—Take successively every principle, every statement, every argument, every demonstration of sound Political Economy; every principle, for instance, admitted by all scholars and all deep thinkers; probe it, sift it, weigh it, trace it back to its first cause and origin; and you will invariably find that it rests on some forgotten maxim of the Gospel or of the Catholic Church. We are well aware that many a superficial student of the dry science, and, above all, many a utilitarian, will be startled at this sweeping assertion, and yet we would readily maintain it against all comers—so abundant,

so satisfactory to an impartial mind are the proofs of its utter truth and soundness.

Let us take, for example, that mainspring of wealth in its various forms—thrift or saving. You cannot imagine a poor workman, or a merchant, or a farmer, or a manufacturer, rising even to an easy competency, unless he puts by every year some hard-earned capital, either to guard against future contingencies, or to create new means of extending his business; in other words, he creates new stock. But how does he accomplish this purpose? He foregoes certain immediate enjoyments, he silences the cravings of his sensual appetites by applying to them a moral screw, which prevents them from ever outrunning the bounds of prudence and economy. Now, we maintain that this moral screw, or moral law, is nothing else but the principle of self-denial and sacrifice, which lies at the very bottom of all Christian virtues. Consider it under every aspect—turn it which way you will—invent as many applications to the social body or to the individual as a fruitful fancy may suggest, the same cyclüs ever returns:—self-renouncement produces saving in regard to the good things of this world; saving engenders wealth; wealth creates new resources; new resources stimulate new efforts, which, in their turn, open new roads to industry and prosperity among Christian nations—as long, at least, as the fundamental principle continues to reign supreme. But let the spirit of self-renunciation and sacrifice either flag or be paralyzed, and the wonderful development of human enterprise undergoes a gradual decline, to be succeeded by a positive and certain collapse if the perturbing force endure for any lengthened period. It is not at first that we perceive the injury arising to society at large out of this unhealthy state of things, though it is sure to become apparent in course of time. Thus, when we see the old Roman patricians violating the law of labour imposed by Providence on every human being—when we see them wallowing in the depths of unheard of luxury—relying upon slaves alone to replenish their drained revenues, we are not long before we discover that the empire was becoming a prey to an internal disease, which had far more to do with its final ruin than the waves of barbarian hordes, surging from German forests and Asiatic wastes against its defenceless frontiers. Strange to say, Christianity itself could not convert the heathens to the virtue of self-renunciation, and one of the most singular passages of S. Augustine is that in which he warns those who embraced the monastic profession that one of their most important duties was to work daily with their own hands. Many were

the degenerate Romans, who fled to the desert from labour as from a dread pestilence. To lead a life of indolence and ease had at last become the *summum bonum* of those whose forefathers took pride in tilling the mountain slopes and deep embedded vales of Latium.

The idea that the fundamental principles of social economy are intimately connected with the religious and moral enactments of the Christian dispensation has dawned of late years on many a Continental philosopher. Once started, the notion went on, daily gaining ground, in spite, or, perhaps, on account of, steadfast opposition on the part of the old school—itself an offshoot of our own utilitarian economists. Many interesting pages might be written on this unexpected evolution in the realms of science, though it would be alien from our purpose to enter into details. Sismondi, in his celebrated works, was, we believe, one of the first to point out the baldness and selfishness of Bentham's doctrines—an undertaking in which he was followed up by Count de Villeneuve Bargemont,\* afterwards superseded by Rossi,† Wolowski, and others. Whilst this was going on in France, Germany did not remain behindhand in its endeavours, lately crowned by the splendid work of Roscher, which we may recommend to the attention of every thinking reader.‡ Nor is this all; for more recently several debating societies have arisen in Paris and elsewhere, all tending to investigate the most difficult of our social problems; and all invincibly brought, through various ways and means, to acknowledge the supremacy of Christianity as a main part and essential foundation of political economy.

It is, therefore, by no means an extraordinary fact that the University of Louvain should have signalized itself in this respect, and produced a standard work, such as the publication issued four years ago by Professor Perin, the pupil and successor of the excellent Count de Coudré, who first established the chair of political economy in that far-famed institution. It is another token of what may be done by Catholics for the good cause, if they will but set their hand to work, and use the right man in the right place. M. Perin's two volumes are the result of many years' labour, and ought to be in the hands

---

\* Sismondi, *Nouveaux Principes d'Economie Politique*. De Villeneuve Bargemont, *Le Paupérisme ou Economie Politique Chrétienne*. 2 vols. 8vo. Very scarce.

† Rossi, *Economie Politique*.

‡ Roscher, *Principes d'Economie Politique*, traduits de l'Allemand par M. Wolowski. Paris: Guillaumin.

of every student who wishes to keep pace with the progress of economic science in a Christian direction.

On opening the very first pages of this work we feel at once that we are on new ground. Almost every other book on political economy limits its scope to the laws of production and consumption. What are the requisites of production,—labour considered as an agent of production,—unproductive labour,—capital in its different bearings,—circulating and fixed capital, together with the degree of productiveness in productive agents. Then come in succession,—co-operation or the combination of labour,—production on a large and on a small scale,—the laws of increase of labour and capital,—and the laws of the increase of production from land, with their consequences as to accumulation, as to population, as to free trade and emigration, and so on to the end. So much for production.

The same system is followed out in regard to the distribution of wealth. What is property, and by what laws it is regulated,—among what classes the produce is distributed,—what are the effects of competition and custom,—of slavery in relation to production,—of peasant proprietors,—on what causes depend high or low wages,—finally, what is the nature of profits and rent; such is generally the leading order of questions broached, and more or less deeply investigated in every work of the kind. Doubtless these questions must all be scientifically and practically treated; but what we complain of is, that the method itself is one-sided, bald, inefficient, willingly leaving out some of the most important problems of human nature. It assumes at once that man is but a useful piece of machinery, endowed with certain moral qualities, and with a certain amount of intellect, for the sole purpose of productiveness. So long as he alone fulfills that purpose, well and good; but let that fine piece of machinery be replaced by a more perfect one, or at least by one procuring a larger and more remunerating amount of production, and man must be cast aside, discarded as a useless, antiquated tool, or banished to other regions, where he may find employment for his natural agencies. Apply the system to our lower classes, and you have that enormous incubus of wretchedness and pauperism, which is at once our shame and our scourge. Apply the system to Ireland, and you have a country systematically depopulated to make way for cattle, as a superior source of production. In fact, the whole moral, intellectual, and physical world is made subservient to one great law:—the production of wealth and the enjoyment of wealth. Man is no longer a superior being, tending with all his innate energies towards a heavenly goal;

he is a grovelling drudge, created for the especial purpose of enriching himself or enriching others. A slave to nature, instead of being the paramount lord of nature, such is his lot.

Now we maintain with M. Perin and the whole Christian school of political economy, that such is not, cannot be his destiny, as ordained by a wise Providence. We maintain that man's nature is in its very essence repugnant to this selfish, heathenish system, which, besides, through its one-sidedness, is utterly unable to solve some of the most important problems of modern society. It is useless to blink the fact; we are beset by dangers on every side, and ruin stares us in the face, notwithstanding our boasted prosperity.

Who would imagine, at least in wealthy England, that an all-absorbing, imperious passion for riches is precisely one of those dangers? And yet, take it as you will, nothing can be truer. As our author very properly states, in this sole passion are concentrated all those perverse instincts, all those unruly and guilty feelings, which, for a whole century, have gone on upheaving, shaking, and degrading society at large; whilst democracy in its worst forms aimed at levelling every sort of social grandeur, one single species of superiority continued to rule omnipotent,—the supremacy of wealth. Finding itself utterly powerless to overthrow this supremacy, democratic pride now aims at rising to the same level, from whence has sprung that keen pursuit of riches, after which is hurrying aristocratic vanity, even among the most democratic levellers. Ask the modern man what he wants? To be rich is the invariable reply;—to be rich, because it is the road to the sole uncontested distinction, to the sole influence still acknowledged by every ranting demagogue. But besides this political cause for the social disease, there are other causes at work and of a deeper nature.

Man has parted from God. He denies the existence of any other law but that of his own reason;—he proclaims the arch-sovereignty of nature;—in other words, his own sovereignty, as being nature's king. And thus he unavoidably abjures the doctrine of self-sacrifice, assuming as lawful and equitable every craving of his own covetous propensities. As he has fallen off from all spiritual life, in which he found a fulfilment of his highest aspirations, he must needs seek for the satisfaction of his most exalted and most progressive instincts in the sensual world. But then he gives up, together with his own dignity, the very foundation of his innate sovereignty. Whilst proclaiming himself his only master, he becomes in fact a slave,—a slave of the worst kind,—a slave to his most degrading appetites.



Nor is it the first time that this passion for wealth has taken possession of the world, in the character of a general and serious evil. Periods of great moral energy, and great intellectual excitement, are not unfrequently followed by a period of debasement and corruption. Then wealth itself as the natural result of the victories won on the battle-field of moral development, induces man to forget the true conditions of his perfection, and pushes him onwards to degeneracy, by the very consequences of his progress and by the abuse of those very forces with which that progress has supplied him. More than once has modern society had to contend against obstacles of this kind; but thanks to the vigour of our Christian constitution, we have hitherto been able to overcome such difficulties. In our days, the passion for wealth has assumed a graver character; for it comes forth at once as a principle and as a doctrine. Some, indeed, have gone so far as to lay down as an undisputed axiom, that wealth is the supreme goal of human activity,—the only key to progress, out of which fundamental principle must arise a new system of social and international relations. For what, indeed, are the hare-brained schools of Saint-Simonianism and Fourierism, but so many shrines built up to the worship of wealth, and ease, and luxury, in every form and garb? Wealth may now boast of its fanatics and enthusiasts, who have framed its laws, who have exalted its wildest consequences.\*

But here again we are met with a new feature of these modern doctrines concerning wealth:—a total indifference as to all the great interests of mankind,—as to injustice, baseness, depravity, provided they make sure of success and gain their object. To this is added a studied and haughty display of moderation, which affects to view every thing under a serious and solid aspect,—to consider all matters by the light of absolute wisdom. To yield to nothing but reason,—to discard any opinions that might trouble her serene rest and undisturbed stillness,—such is the boast; and yet God knows what amount of helpless inertness these fine pretensions contribute to conceal.

The fact is (observes M. Perin), that in a society where enjoyment becomes the great business, it is all over with either a rational forethought of the future, or a sincere respect for the past. How could materialists feel an interest in what is yet unborn? What else can they think of but the enjoyment of the hour, as the only thing secure, the only matter of importance? But when men give themselves up to this utter contempt of the past and the future,

---

\* Perin, vol. i., pp. 1-3.

they likewise become contemptuous and indifferent to each other. Self, self alone, such is their golden rule. Everything must be regulated according to *mine* and *thine*; strict equity alone is to establish the different relations between man and man. As for charity, which implies both self-sacrifice and humility, she will be proclaimed useless and banished, as being incompatible with human dignity. A dry, proud indifference henceforward will become the leading character of social intercourse. But then, what will be the fate of liberty, equality, fraternity—those three great goddesses of our preachers? Of course, they must disappear under a common level, or be crushed under the hardest and most insolent of all tyrannies, the despotism of wealth.

Nay, more: What will become of wealth itself, that idol to which are sacrificed the higher aspirations of the soul? In its turn, it must go on decreasing, and be consumed in the midst of universal impotency. How, indeed, could it maintain its ground in a world wherein all the natural laws of human activity would be disacknowledged? Supposing it even to endure for any length of time, we should doubtless see that wealth concentrated within the hands of a few privileged beings, fortunate enough to secure their own prosperity at the expense of the multitude and of general misery."

Thus it would seem at first sight, as if modern society were destined ever to oscillate between practical heathenism and Christianity. Fortunately the latter contains in itself a spirit of regeneration, a germ of new life and resurrection, by which it is constantly stimulated to repeated efforts, and a continual struggle against infidel tendencies of every description. Of late years this invigorating spirit has become more and more apparent throughout the whole world. In every country, in every rank and condition, there has arisen a race of men unflinching, unsparing, uncompromising, wherever the cause of Truth is in jeopardy. To affirm that Truth with boldness—to defend it by dint of elaborate argument and sound learning—would appear to be their only aim and happiness. To name them would be almost invidious, for those honoured names are on every man's lips, like unto "household words." The religious orders are again teeming in those regions from whence revolutions had expelled them; Catholic associations are called into existence one after the other; the sacerdotal order sets an example of devotedness, of charity, of erudition, hardly paralleled in any age of the Church; crowned despots themselves are obliged to conciliate Catholic opinion, or at least to mask their secret designs under an apparent attachment to the Papacy. Then what are we to fear? Why should we not be all bold in our efforts to reconstruct society according to the pattern laid down by the Divine lawgiver? On what side, in fact, does any real tangible danger show

itself? The answer to the question is by no means far from us, and may be stated in a few lines, which themselves have an immediate bearing on Political Economy.

In consequence of the social doctrines which have prevailed since the opening of the present century, the lower classes of the people are wavering between heathenism in a concrete form and Christianity. Hence the real peril of our times: the poor man, the artisan, the common labourer, have all learned to believe in a sort of compromise between truth and error, the latter borrowing from the former her brightest gems, under the hack-nied name of philanthropy. A new race of quacks have applied themselves to bring about a conciliation between the evil and good instincts of mankind, so that selfishness and the enjoyment of every passion might go hand in hand with devotedness and self-renouncement. Still the meretricious and gaudy phantom dances before the public eye, concealing the dark abyss which yawns behind. The mission of all earnest, thorough-going men is to dispel the delusion with their whole might.

So far have we followed the learned Professor in what we may call his introduction. We shall now proceed to lay down his fundamental principles, though we shall freely avail ourselves at the same time of the opportunity to offer certain observations of our own, as applying more especially to England.

If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.

For he that will save his life, shall lose it; and he that shall lose his life for my sake, he shall find it.

Who would believe that in these words of Our Lord are contained, as in a nutshell, the very foundation of all true social science? To renounce oneself and yet to become rich; to submit to the yoke of the cross, to love poverty, nay, to be poor in spirit, and yet to produce and possess wealth,—what a glaring contradiction, will you be disposed to exclaim.

The fact is that when we come to meditate on this far-famed passage of the gospel, the contradiction is but apparent. To use wealth but not abuse it, such is the well-known law of production as well as of consumption. Make use of wealth for useful purposes, not for the satisfaction of your own sensual and greedy appetites. Is there anything here that clashes with the most approved principles of modern science? Let us pursue this a little further.

Whoever is even superficially versed in the knowledge of

history must have been more than once struck by the contrast existing in this respect between ancient and modern nations. On the one side, a concentration of property among the higher classes, which excluded the commonalty from the fruits of their labours, so as to make the workman little better than a slave. Among Christian nations, on the contrary, we discover at a very early period a strong tendency towards a general and equitable distribution of wealth and property among the whole body politic. Grounded on an ever increasing historical evidence, we might positively affirm, that the mediæval Church brought her whole weight to bear incessantly upon this one singular and single point. Numberless traces of this Christian influence are to be met with in our old chronicles, and are still extant all over continental Europe. A most eminent German economist, struck with this remarkable contrast between heathen and Christian peoples, does not fear, though himself a Protestant, to ascribe our superiority to the above cause; but the cause of the cause itself, where does it lie?

That cause consists in our fundamental idea of society. It implies not only the greatness and prosperity of the whole as a whole, but of every individual, as far as our human nature will admit. The condition of that prosperity, however, is of course the practice of Christian virtues by each individual as well as by the nation at large; in other words, by the practice of self-renunciation. And this at once brings us back to another principle, accepted at all hands and in all times. To abstain from over-indulgence, to lead a middle life of labour and endurance, has ever been found a secret conducing to sound health in the social body no less than among individuals. Such a rule and such a state do not exclude large fortunes any more than they exclude poverty; they simply tend to diminish the extent of the latter, and to banish pauperism or extreme misery—a scourge totally different, let it be remembered, from poverty. It is a remarkable fact, that Mr. Mill himself has been brought to conclusions of a similar character, when animadverting on the vast accumulation of capital in a few hands—that boasted system of almost every English economist.

I cannot (says he) regard the stationary state of capital and wealth with the unaffected aversion so generally manifested towards it by political economists of the old school. I am inclined to believe that it would be, on the whole, a very considerable improvement on our present condition. I confess I am not charmed with the ideal of life held out by those who think that the normal state of human beings is that of struggling to get on; that

the trampling, crushing, elbowing, and treading on each other's heels, which form the existing type of social life, are the most desirable lot of human kind, or anything but the disagreeable symptoms of one of the phases of industrial progress. The northern and middle states of America are a specimen of this stage of civilization in very favourable circumstances ; having apparently got rid of all social injustices and inequalities that affect persons of the Caucasian race and of the male sex ; while the proportion of population to capital and land is such as to ensure abundance to every able-bodied member of the community who does not forfeit it by misconduct. They have the six points of Chartism, and they have no poverty ; and all that these advantages seem to have yet done for them is that the life of the whole of one-sixth is devoted to dollar-hunting, and of the other to breed dollar-hunters. This is not a kind of social perfection which philanthropists to come will feel any very eager desire to assist in realizing. Most fitting, indeed, is it, that while riches are power, and to grow as rich as possible the universal object of ambition, the path to its attainment should be open to all, without favour or partiality. *But the best state for human nature is that in which, while no one is poor, no one desires to be richer, nor has any reason to fear being thrust back, by the efforts of others to push themselves forward.\**

What is this, after all, but Christian language—the very law laid down by the Gospel and the Church ?

The fact is, that the law of self-renunciation rests upon the nature of Man as a free agent, and, *nolens volens*, his very faults bring him back to that supreme law. As a free agent, he lords it over the whole creation, blending within himself a strange mixture of sovereignty and dependence, of grandeur and littleness, of might and helplessness, through which and by which he holds on to God. As a free agent, he is prone to practise self-renunciation ; but, as the earthly lord of the creation, he is apt to forget God, to consider himself supreme master of all things here below, and to use them as if made for him alone. But he soon finds out, to his own cost, that his very selfishness turns against him, thus verifying and justifying the great moral law which he presumed to violate. In a word, by that violation Man diminishes his own sway and power instead of increasing it.

In our fallen state, the practice of self-renunciation can, of course, only be enforced by a constant effort on the part of man ; by a constant grace on the part of God. It is obtained through mortification, through prayer, through humility ; and thus becomes, as our author finely expresses it, “ the heavenly ferment which leavens society ; in great souls it lifts them up

---

\* B. iv. Ch. vi., sec. 2.

to holiness ; but it quickens every thew and sinew of the social body."

And yet, though self-renunciation be the true law of our nature, we must by no means imagine that it contradicts private interest. This is important, for it is the great objection of materialists against our doctrines, as applicable to political economy. Precisely because man is a *person*, he has a personal end or object—a personal interest. Now that interest never can acquire its natural development, but by conforming to the Divine will; and through this very act man increases, extends his own personality in proportion to the surplus of power he receives from an intimate communication with God. And as that personality increases, so does likewise increase his own individual interest. In fact, the personal weal of man gains by his very act of self-renunciation. And this brings us at once to the fact, that Catholicism, whilst establishing self-renunciation as the corner-stone of all social relations, ever admitted private interest not only as lawful in itself, but even as absolutely necessary. "God," says Bossuet, "having resolved to create society, willed that every one should find therein his own good, to which he remains attached by his own interest." So that, after all, we do not proscribe private interest; we simply attack a false application of a sound principle.

If we advance our observations on this subject without allowing ourselves to be influenced by the common-place doctrines of the day, we shall find that this maxim of self-renunciation is the real condition of every moral and material progress—the generating and all-pervading principle of civilization in its several forms and manifestations. For what is civilization itself but the harmonious development of every lawful power and impulse which lie latent in mankind? In our present condition, mankind is perfectible, not perfect, just as every individual man may continually improve, though never rise to utter perfection. So that, to develop fully every human faculty according to the law of unity, or to develop harmoniously every power of humanity—such is the veritable object and mission of civilization. This theory is brought out in strong and vivid colours by M. Perin, in his introduction, which we particularly recommend to our readers.

Let us now see how the above doctrines are applicable, and the only ones really applicable to the science of political economy. First of all, let us observe that the principle of self-renunciation embraces and includes the whole sphere of human activity, both in the production and distribution of wealth. And how is this verified in practice? It evidently



rests on the necessity for every man to labour, either separately or collectively, oftener, indeed, in both ways. Now this collective labour of mankind being founded upon the moral and physical nature of man, reproducing all the great principles of the moral world in spite of contingent and variable circumstances, every individual will feel obliged to give up a part of his own interests, or desires, for the general weal; and hence may arise at once an ideal of social perfection, a universal yearning for the satisfaction of the intellect, for its moral liberty and dignity. At its first starting, a nation is thus almost unconsciously raised to a higher level.

In every form of society the social problem is the following:—How are the numberless and ever-changing interests of the material order to be combined or conciliated with the supernatural centre towards which humanity is constantly gravitating? And when we come to question historical evidence as to the solution of this grand problem in the past, we are not long in discovering that Christianity alone really solves it by securing the greatest freedom to man, and the greatest security to property. The reason is eminently simple: the material world exists but for the full play and development of the moral world; or, still better, the moral order itself does in reality manifest its entirety here below, but within the sphere of the material order; and, consequently, it is by no means surprising that the latter should be ruled by the great laws of our moral life.

Through liberty we fulfil our whole destiny. As it is in the moral, so it is in the world of matter: we make our own fate. As responsible beings, we cannot but undergo the consequences of our own good or evil actions; the power, greatness, prosperity of our life—at least as far as they are dependent on the possession of wealth—rightly observes M. Perin, are all fruits of our own application to labour, of our moderation in using wealth; and, on the other hand, our degradation and misery follow no less invariably on our vices when they induce us to give up labour or to squander away wealth. Again: both in success and misfortune, our fate must ever be intimately linked to the fate of other beings, living and labouring together with ourselves. Whatever affects, either for good or evil, the society of which we are members, affects us likewise to a certain degree; whilst that society, in its turn, must be equally affected, in a certain degree, proportionate to our individual importance, by the results of our acts, whatever may be their character. And if this be true of any particular form of society or nation, it holds equally good of mankind at large; all men, all nations, all societies do but form an

immense aggregate, closely connected with each other in their moral no less than in their material interests. If self-renunciation be indeed the prime mover and regulator of human activity, so mutual responsibility, or what the French now call *solidarity*, must needs ensue from every application and development of the human faculties. Such is the universal law—a law which acts and moves, as it were, through the exercise of our own liberty.

Between that liberty and property there is again an intimate connection. Through its influence over human activity in the production and distribution of wealth, property holds the very very first rank among the subjects of social science. We cannot even imagine its existence without liberty, and must, consequently, follow its divers vicissitudes. One might almost call it an enlargement of man's individuality, as the right of inheritance has been termed a prolongation of a man's life beyond the grave. But, on the other hand, in consequence of that inequality which must always arise in every form of society, and of those obligations that are incumbent on the possession of wealth, property establishes likewise mutual responsibility, by supplying all, rich and poor, with frequent opportunities of practising self-denial; in other words, of ascending to the highest moral perfection. Such, at least, is the ideal of Christian property; thus combining the full development of individual energy, under the impulse of private interest, with a constant practice of charity throughout the whole community. The consequences of this theory are so beautifully exhibited in M. Perrin's work, that we shall offer no apology for quoting the passage at full length:—

When God condemned man to a painful and laborious life, He did but inflict upon him a fatherly punishment. He humbled him in order to chastise his revolt, but at the same time He left him all those sources of grandeur with which man was blessed in a state of innocence. Nay, more: that greatness may be increased through the very penalty awarded by a merciful God. Every conquest, every progress of man over the material world may become the reward of his sacrifices and virtues; so that mankind is enabled to acquire as much wealth as may ensure the possession of splendour and power, and as much merit as resignation to poverty may confer. Poverty calls forth charity, and renders labour indispensable; it bestows upon man the means of practising the noblest virtues; it makes him greater, by enabling him, through his own free-will, to share in God's very first attribute—goodness.

So God has found out, in the wonderful secrets of His Providence, the means of making mankind at one and the same time both rich and poor. Mankind will remain poor, suffering from a real and obligatory poverty

among the people ; but it will be rich also through the wealth of those to whom the principle of property secures an abundant possession of the good things of this life. But that wealth the rich are not to possess for their sole gratification ; themselves free from poverty, they are, however, bound by a law still more difficult to enforce—the law of voluntary poverty. Thanks to the rigorous duties which Christian morals impose upon them, the rich fall back under the general condition of a poor and laborious existence. Society will benefit no less by their possessions than themselves. Again, thanks to that activity which property ever gives to labour,—thanks also to the facilities which property offers for the accumulation and preservation of the wealth created by labour,—capital, in all its various forms, may increase and concentrate its resources ; and hence the fruitfulness of labour, together with the general wealth, will increase apace. Property may also be of use to the multitude in another way—by the splendour with which it may illumine society at large. A normal and selfish luxury is of use only to the few, and brings home corruption as well as degradation to all. On the contrary, the use which a true Christian makes of riches elevates the feelings of the people, and alleviates the sad drudgery of the poor man's existence by the sunshine of public life, and, above all, by the splendour which he can impart to the ceremonies of religion. Wealth enables a rich man, who can rely upon the present and the future, to adorn his own mind, to cultivate his taste, to acquire in his whole being a certain stamp of distinction, which the common man, bending as he is over his daily labour, can, of course, never attain. Now, through the medium of charity, and especially through a system of patronage, all these advantages may accrue to the poor. The rich man, who is disposed to use wealth according to the Christian ideal, will not content himself by sharing with the poor a portion of that wealth ; he will also bestow upon them a part of his time, and of his own being, as it were, whether by a direct donation of himself through works of charity, or through a sincere renunciation of self by filling the higher stations of society in the priesthood, in science, or in the Government. This mission of proprietorship, as defined by the Christian law, is indeed the only plea in favour of the institution itself, and its sole justification. God has so ordained human life that all things induce to perfection through self-renunciation. Property, resting as it does, in reality, on a renouncement of labour, and on an inequality attendant upon the different conditions of human life, is in every respect an opportunity and a means of renouncement, by which alone is it included in the general harmony of a Christian society.

Viewed in this light, property, far from being a stumbling-block and a source of discord, as is the case among certain nations, where either selfishness or communism prevails, becomes a bond of union, an iron link added to the social system. It makes of charity, no less than of justice, a rule binding the whole world ; nay, the very soul of the world. Right or justice acts as a break on man ; charity as the main-spring and germ of life. Thanks to charity, mankind is gradually transformed, realizes more and more completely the ideal

of justice itself, which finds its supreme expression in the Divine law. That law approves and consecrates the inspirations of charity. Human law\* may interfere to guarantee and regulate whatever a nation sanctions in this respect; but law can go no farther. Its scope is limited by the inward dispositions and opinions of a people, by the invisible powers which rule the souls of men, and among these powers charity holds the foremost rank. This is an elementary principle, to which England seems at present a total stranger; but, certainly, it is not a whit the less true for all that. Wherever the Catholic feeling is not quite obliterated, it makes itself heard and felt, in spite of sophistry throughout the whole field of social science. Its enactments, indeed, are now becoming so self-evident, that any doctrine whatsoever, pretending to lay down the general laws of society, without including charity, would be deemed a maimed system, equally devoid of truth and power.

But, after all, an economist of the old school may bring forward an objection, which is, at least, entitled to a cool hearing. Is not this far-boasted harmony between wealth and poverty a mere offspring of the brain, a child of fairy-land and chimera? Is it not an arbitrary conception, by which we endeavour to conciliate things absolutely contradictory? Of two opposite assertions, one must needs be true. If you glorify poverty, you must give up all material improvement. Does not improvement tend to banish poverty? And does not the law of self-renunciation and charity, as enacted by Christianity, does it not aim at perpetuating poverty, and, through poverty, to nip in its very bud the natural growth of wealth?

The reader will do us the justice to admit that we are far from shirking the question or presenting the objection in its weakest form. Let us see how it may be answered, without leaving the ground of political economy, as it is understood in its most usual meaning.

Man creates wealth by his own labour; but every labour, as the term itself implies, is a penalty, a suffering. It is an act of renouncement to self-indulgence, in the widest sense of the word, as every human being is subject to that law, and his life cannot be upheld by any other. Thus, man, through renouncement, overcomes the repugnance which he naturally entertains against the penalty of labour; and by so doing he at once purifies his own heart and rises to a higher level of moral life. Again, his will, being stimulated by influences of a spiritual

---

\* Vol. ii. pp. 537-540.

character, succeeds in conquering the obstacles that nature throws in his way, and the intensity of his labour is increased in proportion to the exact amount of energy which self-renunciation gives to his soul. Analyse the subject, sound its depths,—we defy you to find any other elementary principle. But labour, besides being powerful and energetic, must likewise be intelligent. Now self-renunciation opens the mind of man to truth, and fires him with a wish to communicate it to others, or to diffuse instruction and knowledge in its various forms. This, of course, is the same as to diffuse among every class that intelligence which is indispensable to the success of labour. Again, man was created a free agent, and without freedom he becomes inert, powerless, his faculties are obscured, his energies remain latent. But through the spirit of renunciation, which amounts to nothing more than a mutual feeling and respect for our neighbour, slavery gradually dies out and the supremacy of freedom is secured. Yet, however energetic, however intelligent labour may be, still it requires another agent; to wit, capital. How is capital created, preserved, replenished? Through economy, which itself is grounded on a certain empire of man over his passions, on a certain moderation in his wishes; in fact, on self-renunciation. So that alone it enables man first to create capital, then to preserve it, then to increase it for the benefit of society, extending at the same time his own power from age to age, by the uses to which he may apply an ever-enlarging capital.

Thus, after all, when we come to consider our subject under its principal aspects, we find that the doctrine of self-renunciation, far from limiting capital, or favouring poverty, produces consequences of a most opposite character. The rights of property, being founded on what we may call an accumulation of renuncements, of savings, are naturally disposed to maintain their privileges on the ground of stern and rigorous justice, even unto the oppression of the poor man; but here charity steps in, and by teaching the wealthy proprietor to consider himself rather as a depositor and a trustee than a real owner, she induces him to help his indigent neighbour, both by immediate aid and by the more indirect means of prudent advice. So, by degrees, poverty itself recedes more and more to the back-ground, the national wealth goes on expanding and increasing, whilst, on the other hand, the natural inequality inherent to every condition and to every form of society, is made up for and compensated by the Christian equality of man before his Maker. It would be an easy matter to prove, from historical evidences of the most indisputable character, that such was the general tendency of European society under

the guidance of the Church, during a great part of the Middle Ages. We are far from being blind to the violent and seething passions of those times; but we cannot help being struck with the fact that, at the end of the thirteenth century, the population and wealth of England and France might fear no comparison with those of our own.\* Nor was that an insulated fact, it was simply the result of a long-standing renunciation more particularly on the part of the monks and bishops of old. As the social history of the Middle

---

\* Of late years, the attention of the most eminent French economists has been brought to this subject by several publications on the history of the agricultural and industrial classes. Among others, M. Dureau de la Malle establishes, on most exact calculations, that the population of France was, between 1328 and 1367, at least equal, if not superior, to what it is in our days. His data, we are aware, have been accused of exaggeration by another writer (M. Dareste de la Chavanne, *Hist. des Classes agricoles*, p. 292); and probably M. Dureau de la Malle goes too far, when he affirms that modern France is three times as large as the royal demesnes in 1328. But still the general conclusions of the learned academicians are not weakened, for they are grounded on very moderate calculations. He reckons, indeed, but a very low proportion of persons belonging to every homestead, and does not include large classes, such as the ecclesiastical and secular estates, whose owners were not subjected to any census: the villains, who did not possess ten livres *parisis*; lastly, the regular and secular clergy, the universities, and nobility.

Besides, M. Dureau de la Malle confirms the truth of his statements, grounded on a celebrated manuscript of 1328, by proofs drawn from other sources. He establishes, for instance, that in one part alone of the provinces, known by the name of *Langue d'oïl*, corresponding to about one-third of modern France, the population amounted, for the *tiers*, or middle class, to twelve or fifteen millions. In fact, the states of these provinces, when assembled by the Dauphin Charles during the captivity of King John, bound themselves to maintain 30,000 men, the *tiers-état* engaging to supply one man-of-arms for every hundred homesteads. It is by multiplying these 30,000 men by 100, and by reckoning four or five persons in each homestead, that we come to the amount of twelve millions for the *tiers* alone.

On the other hand, a passage in Froissart enables the French economist to furnish proofs still more decisive in regard to Aquitaine. In 1368 the Black Prince levied in Aquitaine a tax of 1,200,000 fr., rated at one franc for each homestead. Computing still at four souls to every homestead, we arrive at a population of 6,000,000. It must be remembered that old Aquitaine does not form ten modern departments.

There would be no difficulty in adducing many other highly interesting data of the same description. In regard to England, every well-informed reader will remember the glowing picture of the British population and sturdy yeomanry, by Sir J. Fortescue, towards the same period. Hallam confesses likewise, with shame and regret, that the English labourer's wages and lot were far superior in the fourteenth century to what they are at present. He estimates his weekly wages at an average of about 14s. of our currency.

We have borrowed the substance of the above note from M. Perin's work.



Age becomes better known, we perceive more and more that a monastery was a large establishment, combining at once the advantages of a farm, a manufactory, and a benevolent institution for the neighbouring country. It was a training-school for the agricultural population and tenantry, a free college for those disposed to cultivate learning; whilst its long accumulating wealth, the natural offspring of persevering industry, left full scope to inventions and experiments of every description. Much has been said about the merits of Mediæval monasticism in regard to the revival and preservation of classical literature; a day will probably come when their deserts as land-owners, mechanics, artisans, labourers, and inventors, will require ample justice at our hands. At any rate, we already know enough to show that the practice of Christian self-denial, as a foundation to sound political economy, by no means leads either to the perpetuation of poverty, or to the concentration of wealth in a few selfish hands. It is by hundreds that we must count the thriving towns and cities, which grew up protected by the monk's cowl, or by the bishop's crozier.

But why should we linger among the Middle Ages; why not apply the above principles to England in the nineteenth century? Surely, if there be any country where the intrinsic value of these doctrines may be tested, it is in wealthy, industrious England.

Whenever a foreigner sets his foot for the first time on English ground, he is equally struck with the manly virtues of the people and with their glaring shortcomings. Who would not admire their tenacious, indomitable perseverance, their sterling love of truth, their thorough, yet well-regulated freedom, their reliance upon self, their far-boasted hospitality, and, above all, the genial influences of their sober *homes*,—that word of endearment, which has no equivalent in any other language? If all these blessings be not the fruits of sound civilization, where are you to look for them? And yet, how many leading features of the picture do we purposely leave out? Yea, all this is true, and makes up an Englishman to the backbone; but then comes another side of the picture. The stranger on passing through the thoroughfares, in the most wealthy English cities, is appalled by an amount of squalid destitution, unparalleled in any other country. Close to the princely palace, or rich merchant's substantial dwelling, he sees with amazement a mass of filthy abodes—alike the dens of prostitution, of crime, and misery, in their most hideous forms. When he happens at night to pass by a flaring gin-palace, his eye falls upon the shivering form of a woman, half-naked, half-famished, as the poor miserable being hurries on to some dread asylum for the

night, where she has to encounter a new set of horrors, such as our papers have but too recently disclosed. "And is this England?" inquires the stranger. "Has she no remedy for such a state of things? No Church, that can infuse a few Christian feelings and doctrines into this dense mass of corruption, and pauperism, and crime? Are there no doctors who can bring home to the proud and wealthy, both the shame and peril of such a *cloaca maxima*, oozing as it were, its troubled stream through the very foundations of their lordly mansions?"

And when, turning in disgust from the lower ranks of the English social system, the foreigner observes the general bent and tendencies of the middle class, he meets with another anomaly. He witnesses a steeple-chase after wealth as if it were the sole object of mankind's efforts. In this universal scramble for gold every man considers his neighbour as an enemy whom he is bound to crush, if he himself wishes to attain the glittering goal. Little by little, and day by day, each band of greedy competitors becomes convinced that in the possession of money alone is all real *respectability*; and, of course, if this be the case between people of the same rank, how far truer of those belonging to the lower classes. They are used merely as tools or machinery for the fabrication of wealth, cast away or expelled as useless instruments from the land of their birth, or at any rate trampled under foot as soon as they happen to stand in our way. Open the columns of the *Times*, plunge into the works of the most famous English economists, while even an hour away with the novelists, and say if that be not the beginning and end of the doctrine. Nay, more; the very poor are taught scientifically that to abstain from marriage is their first duty, as long as they have not secured a yearly revenue; and that the old precept, "Increase and multiply," is but an old saw.

With principles like these, openly, avowedly promulgated, the stranger soon finds, but this time with astonishment, that the working classes all breathe a feeling of hostility against their masters: not a political or revolutionary hostility, in the modern sense of the word, but an enmity of a deeper cast,—the heartfelt bitter enmity of class against class, of popular might against the coalescing might of wealth. As for right, it has hardly any meaning on either side, so utterly are they both imbued with the prevalent idea that money alone can give power, and influence, and position in life. This, indeed, is so far the truth that in all the strikes undertaken and carried on by trade-unions not the slightest tittle of freedom was left to the working-man to escape from the despotism of the union, were it even to save his starving

family from death or destitution. Strike he must, on penalty of undergoing the most brutal treatment, sometimes even of losing his life.

Such are the things among many others which a stranger may witness on visiting far-famed England. Now we merely ask the question,—Is this a safe state of society? Is this the object of any civilized society? Or, again, is it possible that such a system should endure for any lengthened period? Is it conformable to that social pattern which is contained in the Christian dispensation? To find anything like it, observe, we must go back to the worst periods of the Roman empire, when, under the dazzling splendour and unexampled prosperity of the higher classes, there was festering underneath a disease which ended in corroding the very vitals of the whole system, and brought on its death. And, lastly, we must not forget that England alone, throughout all Europe, presents such an astonishing spectacle, which seems to defy the power of all remedies.

*Seems*, did we say?—because, in fact, there does exist a remedy of a most efficacious nature. Doubtless, among other nations, even amongst those professing the Catholic faith, there is a class well known as following in the footsteps of the British people,—a class making Mammon their god, thirsting and fighting for money as the sole source of happiness, the sole blessing here below. But still, when you obtain a deeper knowledge of this class, you soon find out that they generally entertain a more healthy idea of what is the real object of human society. As a rule, they do *not* consider wealth as the only centre of all our hopes, nor the enjoyment of wealth as the sole aim worth our efforts. Notwithstanding in France, for example, the prevalence of theoretical and practical infidelity for a whole century, the old Christian, Catholic principle, that man must renounce himself and use his wealth for the benefit of others, as a providential trustee, has positively maintained its ground even in hearts acknowledging scarcely any other maxim of the Gospel. Of late this feeling has grown even stronger and stronger, so that large railway companies, rich manufacturers, wealthy landowners esteem it a positive and rigorous duty on their part to expend a portion of their lawful gains on the moral weal and bodily comfort of the working classes, who contribute by their hard labour to those profits. Now it must be well understood that this patronage of a new character does not necessarily assume the form of charity; nor, if such is the case, does the working-man deem himself humbled and mortified because his employers have endeavoured to fulfil their duty towards him in such things as

were literally beyond the artisan's reach through his own personal energy. In fact, on the part of the master you do not meet with that proud, haughty idea of self-importance, that domineering notion of omnipotence, which is so prevalent in England; nor on the part of the working class, as a body, do you meet with that instinctive hatred which impels them to rise periodically all as a single man against their employers. To those who are acquainted with France and Germany the fact is self-evident, in spite of the clashing interests of both parties on certain occasions, which, however, tend daily to become less and less frequent. A recent example will enable us to convey our meaning better to the reader.

Till the last two years the French law severely prohibited strikes and lock-outs of every description. Masters and men were alike amenable to the Courts of Justice, and liable to imprisonment in case of coalition being proved on either side. A greater injustice could hardly be imagined, since the workman had no means of redress against the grinding covetousness of his employer, nor the latter against the unruly and unjust pretensions of his men. In fact, the law had been framed in times coming immediately after a tremendous revolution, and, in reality, for very different purposes. However, in spite of common sense, it had been maintained by each succeeding Government. Over and over again, economists, journalists, and members of Parliament had exposed its inconsistencies,—all was of no avail; but, in 1863, a case was brought before a Paris court, which at once moved public opinion and the Government in a contrary direction.

In 1823, a tariff of wages had been agreed to between the Paris printers and their workmen. For the space of forty years, this tariff had been maintained against wind and tide; we mean, against the economical alterations which had been taking place during that long period. Rents had risen, the price of provisions had risen, revolutions had come and gone; yet still the masters held their own against all comers; for the law was on their side, and the workmen were helpless. A strike would inevitably expose them to heavy fines and to a jail. The case was the more heart-rending that printers, as a class, are generally better behaved and better informed than their equals belonging to other crafts. Some of them, indeed, might put to shame, on social questions, certain writers of distinction. After applying in vain to their masters for redress, in a tone of moderation, which drew forth universal applause, they determined upon a strike. The consequences were apparent; judged and condemned, they at least had an opportunity of bringing their grievances before the public,

and before the bench, which showed a keen sense of their wrongs, though bound by law to pronounce sentence against them. From that sentence they boldly appealed to the Emperor, who was by no means loth to remit the penalty. The final result of this contest was a bill presented by Government, and adopted by the Legislative Body, allowing strikes to both masters and workmen, as long as they do not bring them about by fraudulent measures and manœuvres of a dangerous character for the general security.

We said that public opinion went with the victims of the old law. But hardly had the new one superseded its predecessor, when a strong reaction ensued. Many were afraid that the working classes would make use of their new-bought liberty by initiating strikes of a most disorderly nature; and the opponents of the law were not the last in producing the example of England. But facts soon told against these prophets of evil; for a whole year, strike upon strike went on, as if the working classes were determined to see how far they might use the enjoyment of their liberty,—and yet no unlawful or criminal excess took place; little by little the mutual claims were adjusted in a way satisfactory to both parties. Now, how are we to account for this praiseworthy result? During the whole contest, the press, and the benevolent societies, learned professors, as well as manufacturers, statesmen and landowners, leading workmen and economists, all displayed the greatest energy in throwing light upon the question; in showing that whether you looked at it from a Christian point of view, or as a matter of political economy, it was the interest of all to give up extreme claims, to stand upon forbearance and self-denial, rather than on the strict justice, which, in such cases turns out to be *summa injuria*. So that, after all, in a most perilous crisis for any nation, the Christian doctrine we here proclaim had its effects upon society at large; the good work which had been going on silently for years and years among every class of the French people, at last knit them together in a bond of common union, just as the oil enables every spring and limb of some giant-machinery to play its contributive part in the process of production. Doubtless, much remains still to be accomplished in the same direction, but the principle itself is sufficiently powerful to be considered as fruitful of the most important consequences for the future.

From the question of strikes and mammon-worship, there is no great distance to that of population, more intimately connected with the former than is usually supposed. Since the time of Malthus, the English school of economists has adopted his theory, as Mr. Stuart Mill has recently borne evidence.

A more false and immoral system it is scarcely possible to imagine. We must not, therefore, be astonished that of late years a steady current of reaction should have set in among the most eminent Continental writers on this all-important subject.

To provide a numerous population (says the German economist, Roscher) with the easiest means of supporting life,—such must ever be the paramount object of all economical progress. A dense population is not only a sign that the productive forces are developed in a high degree of energy; it likewise in itself evinces a productive force of the greatest power, since it acts as a strong incentive to stimulate and facilitate the application of every other force.\*

A French writer, M. Wolowski; expresses himself on the same subject in the following manner:—

The sound doctrine in regard to population is, never to separate the numbers of a people from the means of self-support. To separate these two terms of the problem is merely to be going wrong. It is not enough that population should increase, if it be at the cost of suffering and moral degradation: misery is ever prolific, but it brings neither strength to the state, nor activity to individuals. On the other hand, if you content yourself with a larger amount of comfort, accruing to each member of a stationary or retrograde population, you reduce the problem of the wealth of nations to an arithmetical proportion by far too simple. Doubtless, if the numbers of those who share in this greater amount of comfort neither do decrease nor increase, whilst production is enlarged, the share of each individual may become larger. But by such a result of civilization, should we not incur a danger of another description? If it be true that no nation ought to give up foresight and prudence, would it not be sufficient, in order to stimulate its activity, and prevent an excessive overplus of population, to cultivate the soul and enlighten the intellect? Among an enlightened and moral people, an increase of production will invariably precede an increase in the number of citizens. What, indeed, would become of the wealthiest and most civilized nations, were they to cling to an exclusive and narrow principle, by applying their whole energy to the prevention of an over-abundance of inhabitants? They would certainly run the risk of offering an easy prey to younger nations, whose numbers and power would be on the increase.

The human mind conquers more and more a supremacy over the elements, and subjects them to its own power. In our days we know perfectly well what we are to think of the pastorals of olden times: we know that man obtains wealth only by dint of sheer might. The wonderful discoveries of modern science have armed him with the strongest agents, thus supplying a more abundant productiveness to labour, and bringing forth greater results, with an ever-decreasing outlay of force and capital. Far from proving an obstacle, the intensity and activity of this larger production ought to act as a

---

\* *Principes d'Economie Politique*, sec. 255.



lever for the further increase of population. And so will it be found that the most civilized nations are also the strongest, and most able to defend the wealth and enlightenment which they have procured. Vauban was quite of this opinion when he said :—" *The greatness of sovereigns consists in the number of their subjects, not in the extent of their states.*"

It would be difficult to lay down the law of population in terms more contradictory to the modern English school than in the above lines, which are but a fair exponent of Continental tendencies of thought. It has been the lot of English economists to revive, unconsciously, perhaps, those infamous theories by which the heathen philosophers of Greece proposed to prevent an inconvenient surplus of population. It would be useless to prove that Malthus was a sensualist. His whole system tends to show that substantial food, comfortable clothing, a snug dwelling, and whatever may protect us against the alternatives of cold and hunger, are the only stimulants of human activity. According to his theory, no one can deny that the wish to satisfy these wants procures numberless advantages, provided it be properly governed. Of course, when that wish promotes unlawful acts, society has a right to repress them ; but still the wish in itself is no less natural—no less *virtuous*. To the love of self we owe every effort through which we strive to better our condition, every noblest work of the human mind, every thing, in fact, by which civilization is distinguished from the state of savages.

With notions like these, Malthus is a total stranger to the idea of sacrifice and self-denial. As M. Perin very justly observes, the ascending movement of the population, ever accompanied by a far slower rise in the general production, together with the difficulty of self-support experienced by the lower classes in consequence of this state of things,—all this assumes in his eyes the proportions of a most appalling calamity. At the same time, he acknowledges that no one can escape from this high-standing law, which ever acts as a drawback on the material progress of mankind. On the other hand, as Malthus admits his utter helplessness to modify this state of things, he endeavours to overcome the difficulty by preventing an indefinite increase of population ; so that a smaller number of men being thus enabled to enjoy the material blessings attendant upon wealth and comfort, the great object of his utilitarian utopia may be attained.

Before proceeding further, we must acquit Malthus of all

---

\* *Mémoire sur l'Administration d'Henri IV.*, Académie des Sciences Morales, 1855.

the immoral conclusions which his fanatic disciples have drawn from his doctrines. He constantly appeals to virtue, but to virtue of a most subaltern character, and very well adapted to his own theories. To the lower classes, above all, he recommends a moral restraint, or "to abstain from marriage, whilst leading a life of chastity." But, then, the *primum mobile* of this moral restraint rests upon no other foundation than self-interest. The enjoyment of comfort and ease, such is the great inducement to the famous moral restraint. Turn which way you will you never get beyond this argument.

But when we come to weigh the real value of the doctrine, we are surprised to find it teeming with absurdities and inconsistencies. First of all, let us observe, that a thorough-going utilitarian will deem it preposterous on your part to expect that he should give up the most imperious propensity of human nature for the sake of a boasted comfort and ease, which, after all, he may never attain. For it is by no means proved that by diminishing the population you would thus increase the general wealth, and the power of production. Who would maintain that by extending luxury one increases the amount of labour? Is not the contrary position far nearer the truth, and do we not see daily idleness and dissipation particularly prevalent among the upper classes? And is not a laborious and painful life one of the strongest stimulants to renewed energy?

As for any moral restraint, how can we expect such a miracle from a man imbued with these principles? Marry, to be sure, he may not, and probably will not; but why he should not abandon himself to his senses, we really cannot see any reason whatsoever. He may fairly consider this as a matter of interest and pleasure; so that after all, you have simply opened the door wide to sin on a grand scale. We should like to know how the population will decrease, and how the poorer classes will be thus brought to a larger enjoyment of comfort. Undoubtedly, Malthus has entered his protest against this result of his theory; but what is the value of such a protest when brought face to face with its practical consequences as they are already realized elsewhere?

We are sorry to state that the eminent English economist, Mr. Stuart Mill, is a staunch defender of the Malthusian system. Like his celebrated predecessor, he supports a stationary condition of society, founded on self-interest. To rest and be thankful in the midst of a certain amount of material enjoyment,—such must be the ideal, when once you admit the premisses. He strongly appeals to public opinion, in order to support his theory of a *moral restraint*; "for" says he, "men

are seldom found to brave the general opinion of their class, unless supported by some principle higher than regard for opinion, or by some strong body of opinion elsewhere." Mr. Mill supposes that women would naturally be in favour of this *moral restraint*, and that for a very good reason.

It is never by the choice of the wife (he observes) that families are too numerous; on her devolves (along with all the physical suffering, and at least a full share of the privations) the whole of the intolerable domestic drudgery resulting from the excess. To be relieved from it would be hailed as a blessing by multitudes of women who now never venture to urge such a claim, but who would urge it, if supported by the moral feelings of the community. Among the barbarisms which law and morals have not yet ceased to sanction, the most disgusting surely is, that any human being should be permitted to consider himself as having a right to the person of another. If the opinion were once generally established among the labouring class that their welfare required a due regulation of the numbers of families, the respectable and well-conducted of the body would conform to the prescription, and only those would exempt themselves from it who were in the habit of making light of social obligations generally; and there would be then an evident justification for converting the moral obligation against bringing children into the world who are a burthen to the community, into a legal one; just as in many other cases of the progress of opinion, the law ends by enforcing against recalcitrant minorities, obligations which to be useful must be general, and which, from a sense of their utility, a large majority have voluntarily consented to take upon themselves.\*

It was essential to our purpose to show, that when once you give up the Christian foundation of all *moral restraint*, you are invincibly brought to the destruction of the family,—at least, as far as it has been hitherto understood,—and to a downright confiscation of individual liberty; for such is finally the result of Mr. Mill's theory. But why should we stop to refute this theory, when its practical consequences are staring us in the face? In certain parts of Europe, the law prohibits marriage among labourers and artisans, unless they can show a certain competency. Such is the case among the miners of Austrian Carniola, in Hanover, in the Swiss canton of Berne, and we believe also in Bavaria. After stating the facts, M. Leplay, one of the most acute observers of our times, remarks on these regulations:—"They not only contradict morals, but they do not even attain the end for which they were enacted. Thus, the workmen belonging to the corporation of T—— all contract, from their youth upwards, unlawful unions, that are

---

\* Principles of Political Economy, vol. i., b. ii., sec. 2.

legitimated by a subsequent marriage."\* In Switzerland, the same measures have been attended by an increase instead of a decrease of misery, so that we have a pauper in every ninth inhabitant;† whilst in Mecklenburg-Schwerin, where the same law prevails, M. Roscher places beyond dispute results of a similar character.‡ And yet public opinion, in the above countries, goes as far as Mr. Mill could wish. In fact, the system itself is but too fruitful in vice and pauperism in their most degrading forms.

There would be no difficulty in demonstrating, by a formidable array of arguments and facts, how absurd and immoral is the Malthusian theory, were we not bound to remember that we are reviewing a work, not writing a treatise, upon Political Economy. The reader desirous of pushing any farther his investigations, will do well to consult M. Perin; a surer and more trustworthy guide he can hardly select. Our principal object in this paper has been to show the intimate connection which exists between Catholic principles and the foundations of the social science. We shall have fully gained that object, if we likewise induce our readers to discard that mistrust of economical truths, which, unfortunately is still so prevalent among many persons. Because we are bound to prefer the spiritual to the material world, that is no reason why we should despise the latter; for it was no less created by a loving Father for our especial purposes, and faithfully obeys His laws. We may violate and distort them, it is not in our power to unmake them. Would it not be far better for us to study them in their sundry applications to human labour, sure that they can but echo back the Divine voice? A sound and deep Catholic economist might sometimes do as much good as the best preacher.

Christians, practical Christians, observed at Malines an eminent French Catholic, M. Cochin, are too often deficient in logic. We are but too prone to accuse Adam's original fall of numberless material consequences, with which it has really nothing to do; and among these we may reckon a certain curse denounced against matter—a curse existing only in our own diseased brain. Why should not the Redemption produce its effect upon the body, as well as upon the soul? Has

\* *Les Ouvriers Européens*. Monogr. xiii., l. xiv.

† Monnier, *Hist. de l'Assistance*, p. 561.

‡ In Mecklenburg-Schwerin, illegitimate births stand as follows:—In 1800=1 : 16; 1851=1 : 4, 5; 1850-1855=1 : 4, 8. In the year 1851 the proportion rose in 260 places to one-third of the population; in 209 others to more than one-half; whilst in 79 the proportion of illegitimacy was trebled! The proportion is not even so large in Paris.

it not already changed the conditions of Labour, of Production, of Consumption, throughout the whole world? Why should there not be an earthly Atonement, though, of course, of an inferior character to the other; but still resulting from the death of our blessed Redeemer? The idea itself has been so beautifully developed by our highly-esteemed friend, that we will make free with this part of his speech by way of conclusion:—

Jesus Christ has restored to man the strength of his reason by connecting it with God, and he has also restored the strength of God's love towards us, by obtaining forgiveness for man. Being stronger, man casts upon the infinite a bolder eye; having become more indulgent, God opens somewhat wider the outlet upon that infinite. Man not so helpless, God not so severe—such are the two great results of Christianity.

It is in this sense we must consider Christianity as being the father of all progress, of all discoveries,—not, indeed, because it reveals them to Christians alone, but because Christianity has made man, every man, more capable of realizing them. And after thus establishing this fundamental principle, I should wish you to observe how verily every discovery and every progress bears the imprint of the Redemption. Yea, we purchase all, we redeem all. Since Adam, man is condemned to redeem himself; but since Jesus Christ, he is helped in that work of redemption.

The earth hides and seems to refuse those blessings which she contains, however for us alone:—we are obliged to conquer them. God hands over to us all created objects, in a sort of chaotic confusion, just as a father gives his child a pell-mell alphabet, in order that the child may himself learn how to assemble the different letters. So, in all times, man was able to redeem himself from cold and heat, from rain, from hunger, from the enmity of nature, from the injustice of his fellow-man, from the evil propensities of his own person. Though supported throughout his hard labour by certain common blessings, such as the air, light, water; and by certain natural forces, such as gravitation, attraction, affinity—blessings and forces which are gratuitous gifts made by God to all;—yet how arduous still is that work, how heavy that labour! But of a sudden, man appears to receive more help, even in a matter-of-fact sense of the word, from the day when light and forgiveness came down from heaven. His reason is more lucid, his will more straightforward, his labour more fruitful. Nay, at every instant, a free bounty falls out of the Divine treasury of goodness, ever delivering our souls and bodies from some obstacle or burthen. Compare the state of the world before Christ and after Christ, and then observe how Christian societies go on, gradually imparting their own blessings to every other community. There is exactly the same difference as if a captive laden with chains were to meet with a deliverer, who would help him to break, one after another, every link of the irons weighing heavily on his limbs.

Our Lord, whilst redeeming our souls, and giving to us habits and laws which have ransomed us from iniquity and vice, has bestowed on our mind a greater capacity for redeeming our body from the numberless shackles that

fetter it. As I am on the ground of matter, and of visible objects, I must confine myself to that lower region, and show you the progress of our deliverance in this direction.

The telescope and the microscope have redeemed the limits imposed upon the curiosity of our sight, by opening before our eyes the impalpable heavens, and the opacity of the earth ;—the mariner's needle—that clock which points to places ; and the watch—that other needle pointing to time—have opened ocean upon ocean.

The discovery of America and of printing, once granted to the bold researches of man, have, as it were, added a supplement to our globe, and a supplement to our mind.

Again, the steam-engine has redeemed man's limbs from a large part of their most painful labours. This powerful invention, which, under a thousand different forms, replaces the sweat of man by the sweat of water, has multiplied a hundredfold the mass of objects destined to satisfy our wants, by diminishing the sum of efforts required to produce them. Coal—that black stone, out of which the genius of man extracts heat, power, motion, and light—coal, combining with a metal, forms and animates numberless engines, those slaves of mankind in the nineteenth century that have superseded the slaves who were the machinery of the world nineteen centuries before Christ, to use the words of an American poet.

In a few hours, when night has spread her thick shades over us, an invisible and filmy gas, impelled into a tapering tube by some careless hand, will redeem us from darkness.

When being absent, we wish to meet our friends, a small iron wire, something like a hyphen, we might say, redeems our bodies from distance. To greet our own fatherland, to transmit our impressions and affection to a beloved and loving family, a spark running along this wire redeems our souls and feelings from the pangs of absence. And, if you please, at this very moment, a ray of the sun, under the guidance of an artist, may send your image home, and thus redeem us in another way from absence.

Indeed, you must believe me when I say that the Church, whose special mission is to suppress all distance between God and man, views with delight all improvements tending to suppress distance between man and man. It will doubtless be one day a source of honour to our age, that it shall be called, in a material, legal, political, and social view, a shortener of distances . . .

Now all these improvements in industry, arts, and sciences, do restore, by degrees, the alliance broken off between earthly and heavenly blessings ;—an alliance which, according to our traditions, was really the primeval plan of God upon His Creation. And this is what you call material progress ?—No, no ; it is all moral improvement. We might as well call printing a material improvement whilst thinking of the printing-type, not of what is printed ; whilst thinking of the ink-roller of the press, not of the thoughts brought suddenly into an immortal life. To redeem man from the crushing burden of that distance which swallows up so much of his fleeting time, cramps his studies, stifles his claims and remonstrances ; to make easier our life as well as our relations, our researches, and our intercourse ; to facilitate likewise missions, councils, meetings of every description ; to strike out new roads for govern-



ment, for peace-making messages, or bearing help to the oppressed, to the sick, to fighting soldiers, to weeping exiles ;—all these improvements, I say, are moral, purely moral. And, indeed, we may say the same, in a certain light, of every sort of progress, whether it be in agriculture, that carries both meat and wine to the table of the poor man ; or the machinery that redeems an effort ; or chloroform, redeeming a pang ; or short-hand, redeeming the infirmity of memory ; or lithography, nailing a graceful image on the garret-wall of a poor girl ; or photography, bestowing on the poor artisan family-likenesses, that great boon of the rich man ; or, in fact, any one of those inventions which make a profession less unhealthy, purer the air we breathe, more abundant the water we drink, life more easy, the body more vigorous, the soul more free. Again I repeat it, every science is one of God's arguments, and every progress one of God's instruments.

---

---

#### ART. IV.—THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS OF ALEXANDRIA.—ORIGEN.

*Origenis Opera Omnia*, Ed. DE LA RUE, accurante J. P. MIGNÉ. Parisiis.  
*S. Gregorii Thaumaturgi Oratio Panegyrica in Origenem* (Opera Omnia),  
accurante J. P. MIGNÉ. Parisiis.

LAST July we commenced a sketch of the history and labours of Origen. We resume our notes on those twenty years (211-230) which he spent with little interruption at Alexandria, engaged chiefly in the instruction of the Catechumens. We have already seen what he did for the New Testament ; let us now study his labours on the Old.

The authorship of that most famous Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, seems destined to be a mystery in literature. The gorgeous and circumstantial account of the Jew Aristæas, with all its details of embassy and counter-embassy, of the seventy-two venerable sages, the cells in the rock, the reverence of the Ptolemy, and the wind-up of banquets, gifts, and all good things, seems, as Dom Montfaucon says, to "savour of the fabulous." There is some little difficulty about dates in the matter of Demetrius Phalerius, the literary minister under whose auspices the event is placed. There is a far more formidable difficulty in the elevation of Philadelphus, a cruel, sensual despot, into a devout admirer of the law of Moses, bowing seven times and weeping for joy in presence of the sacred documents, and in the sudden conversion of all the cultivated Greeks who are concerned in the story. The part of Aristæas's narration

which regards the separate cells, and the wonderful agreement of the translations, is curtly set down by S. Jerome as a fiction. It seems probable, moreover, that the translator of the Pentateuch was not the same as the translator of the other parts of the Old Testament. In the midst of uncertainties and probabilities, however, four things seem to be tolerably clear; first, that the version called the LXX. was made at Alexandria; secondly, that it was the work of different authors; thirdly, that it was not inspired; fourthly, that it was a holy and correct version, quoted by the Apostles, always used in the Greek Church, and the basis of all the Latin editions before S. Jerome's Vulgate.

All the misfortunes that continual transcription, careless blundering, and wilful corruption could combine to inflict upon a manuscript had fallen to the lot of the Septuagint version at the time when it was handed to Origen to be used in the instruction of the faithful and the refutation of Jew and Greek. This was only what might have been fully expected from the fact that, since the Christian era, it had become the court of appeal of two rival sets of controversialists—the Christian and the Jew. Indeed, from the very beginning it had been defective, and, if we may trust S. Jerome, designedly defective; for the Septuagint translation of the Prophetical books had purposely omitted passages of the Hebrew which its authors considered not proper to be submitted to the sight of profane Greeks and Gentiles. Up to the Christian era, however, we may suppose great discrepancies of manuscript did not exist, and that those variations which did appear were not much heeded in the comparatively rare transcription of the text. The Hellenistic Jews and the Jews of Palestine used the LXX. in the synagogues instead of the Hebrew. A few libraries of great cities had copies, and a few learned Greeks had some idea of their existence. Beyond this there was nothing to make its correctness of more importance than that of a liturgy or psalm-book. But, soon after the Christian era, its character and importance were completely changed. The Eunuch was reading the Septuagint version when Philip, by divine inspiration, came up with him and showed him that the words he was reading were verified in Jesus. This was prophetic of what was to follow. The Christians used it to prove the divine mission of Jesus Christ; the Jews made the most of it to confute the same. Thereupon, somewhat suspiciously, there arose among the Jews a disposition to underrate the LXX., and make much of the Hebrew original. Hebrew was but little known, whereas all the intellectual commerce of the world was carried on by

means of that Hellenistic Greek which had been diffused through the East by the conquests of Alexander. If, therefore, the Jews could bar all appeals to the well-known Greek, and remove the controversy to the inner courts of their own temple, the decision, it might be expected, would not improbably turn out to be in their own favour. Just before Origen's own time more than one Jew or Judaizing heretic had attempted to produce Greek versions which should supersede the Septuagint. Some ninety years before the period of which we write, Aquila, a Jewish proselyte of Sinope, had issued what professed to be a literal translation from the Hebrew. It was so uncompromisingly literal that the reader sometimes found the Hebrew word or phrase imported bodily into the Greek, with only the slight alteration of new characters and a fresh ending. Its purpose was not disavowed. It was to furnish the Greek-speaking Jews with a more exact translation from the Hebrew, in order to fortify them in their opposition to Christianity. Some five years later, Theodotion, an Ebionite of Ephesus, made another version of the Septuagint; he did not profess to re-translate it, but only to correct it where it differed from the Hebrew. A little later, and yet another Ebionite tried his hand on the Alexandrian version: this was Symmachus. His translation was more readable than that of Aquila, as not being so utterly barbarous in expression; but it was far from being elegant, or even correct, Greek.

Of course Origen could never dream of substituting any of these translations for the Septuagint, stamped as it was with the approbation of the whole Eastern Church. But still they might be made very useful; indeed, notwithstanding the original sin of motive to which they owed their existence, we have the authority of S. Jerome, and of Origen himself, for saying that even the barbarous Aquila had understood his work and executed it more fairly than might have been expected. What Origen wanted was to get a pure Greek version. To do this he must, of course, compare it with the Hebrew; but the Hebrew itself might be corrupt, so he must seek help also elsewhere. Now these Greek versions, made sixty, eighty, ninety years before, had undoubtedly, he could see, been written with the Septuagint open before their writers. Here, then, was a valuable means of testing how far the present manuscripts of the Septuagint had been corrupted during the last century at least. He himself had collected some such manuscripts, and the duties of his office made him acquainted with many more. From the commencement of his career he had been accustomed to compare and criticise them, and he had grown skilful, as may be supposed, in distinguish-

ing the valuable ones from those that were worthless. We have said sufficient to show how the idea of the *Hexapla* arose in his mind. The *Hexapla* was nothing less than a complete transcription of the Septuagint side by side with the Hebrew text, the agreement and divergence of the two illustrated by the parallel transcription of the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus; the remaining column containing the Hebrew text in Greek letters. The whole of the Old Testament was thus transcribed sixfold in parallel columns. In some places there were seven, eight, and even nine columns. These extra illustrations were furnished by the partial use of three other Greek versions which Origen found or picked up in his travels, and which he considered of sufficient importance to be occasionally used in his great work. And Origen was not content with the mere juxta-position of the versions. The text of the Septuagint given in the *Hexapla* was his own; that is to say, it was an edition of the great authoritative translation completely revised and corrected by the master himself. It was a great and a daring work. Of its necessity there can be no doubt; but nothing except necessity could have justified it; and it is certainly to the bold and unprecedented character of the enterprise that we owe the shape that he has given it in performance. To correct the Septuagint to his own satisfaction was not enough; it must be corrected to the satisfaction of jealous friends and, at least, reasonable enemies. Side by side, therefore, with his amended text he gave the reasons and the proofs of his corrections. He was scrupulously exact in pointing out where he had altered by addition or subtraction. The Alexandrian critics had invented a number of critical marks of varied shape and value, which they industriously used on the works about which they exercised their propensity to criticize. Origen, "Aristarchus sacer," as an admiring author calls him, did not hesitate to avail himself of these profane *notæ*. There was the *asterisk*, or star, which marked what he himself had thought it proper to insert, and which, therefore, the original authors of the Septuagint had apparently thought it proper to leave out. Then there was the *obelus*, or spit, the sign of slaughter, as S. Jerome calls it; passages so marked were not in the original Hebrew, and were thereby set down as doubtful and suspected by sound criticism. Moreover, there was the *lemniscus*, or pendent ribbon, and its supplement, the *hypo-lemniscus*; what these marks signified the learned cannot agree in stating. It seems certain, however, that they were not of such a decided import as the first two, but implied some minor degree of divergence from the Hebrew, as for instance in those passages where the

translators had given an elegant periphrasis instead of the original word, or had volunteered an explanation which a critic would have preferred to have had in the margin. The asterisk and obelus still continue to figure in those scraps of Origen's work that have come down to us; so, indeed, does the lemniscus; but since the times of S. Epiphanius and S. Jerome no MS. seems to make much distinction between it and the asterisk. Of the other marks, contractions, signs, and references which the MSS. of the Hexapla show, the greater part have been added by transcribers who had various purposes in view. Some of these marks are easy to interpret, others continue to exercise the acumen of the keenest critics.

The Hexapla, as may be easily supposed, was a gigantic work. The labour of writing out the whole of the Old Testament six times over, not to mention those parts which were written seven, eight, or nine times, was prodigious. First came the Hebrew text twice over, in Hebrew characters in the first column, in Greek in the second. Biblical scholars sigh to think of the utter loss of Origen's Hebrew text, and of what would now be the state of textual criticism of the Old Testament did we possess such a Hebrew version of a date anterior to Masoretic additions. But among the scattered relics of the Hexapla the Hebrew fragments are at once fewest in number, and most disputable in character. The two columns of Hebrew were followed by Aquila the stiff, and he by Symmachus, so that the Jews could read their Hebrew and their two favourite translations side by side. Next came the Septuagint itself, pointed, marked, and noted by the Master. Theodotion closed the array, except where portions of the three extra translations before mentioned had to be brought in. Besides these formidable columns, which may be called the text of the Hexapla, space had to be found for Origen's own marginal notes, consisting of critical observations and explanations of proper names or difficult words, with perhaps an occasional glance at the Syriac and Samaritan. Fifty enormous *volumina* would hardly have contained all this, when we take into consideration that the characters were in no tiny Italian hand, but in great broad uncial penmanship, such as befitted the text and the occasion. The poverty and unprovidedness of Origen would never have been able to carry such a work through, had not that very poverty brought him the command of money and means. It is always the detached men who accomplish the really great things of the world. Origen had converted from some form of heresy, probably from Valentinianism, a rich Alexandrian named Ambrose.

The convert was one of those zealous and earnest men, who, without possessing great powers themselves, are always urging on and offering to assist those who have the right and the ability to work, but perhaps not the means, or the inclination. The adamant Origen required no one to keep him to his work; and yet the grateful Ambrose thought he could make no better return for the gift of the faith than to establish himself as prompter-in-chief to the man that had converted him. He seems to have left his master very little peace. He put all his wealth at his service, and it would appear that he even forced him to lodge with him. He was continually urging Origen to explain some passage of Scripture, or to rectify some doubtful reading. During supper he had manuscripts on the table, and the two criticized while they ate; and the same thing went on in their walks and recreations. He sat beside him far into the night, prayed with him when he left his books for prayer, and after prayer went back with him to his books again. When the master looked round in his catechetical lectures, doubtless the indefatigable Ambrose was there, note-book in hand, and doubtless everything pertaining to the lectures was rigidly discussed when they found themselves together again; for Ambrose was a deacon of the Church, and as such had great interest in its external ministration. Origen calls him his *ἐργωδιώκτης*, or *work-presser*, and in another place he says he is one of God's work-pressers. There is little doubt that the Hexapla is in great measure owing to Ambrose. Origen resisted long his friend's solicitations to undertake a revision of the text; reverence for the sacred words, and for the tradition of the ancients, held him back; but he was at length prevailed upon. Ambrose, indeed, did a great deal more than advise and exhort; he put at Origen's disposal seven short-hand writers, to take down his dictations, and seven transcribers to write out fairly what the others had taken down. And so the gigantic work was begun. When it was finished we cannot exactly tell, but it cannot have been till near the end of his life, and it was probably completed at Tyre, just before he suffered for the faith. After his death, the great work, *opus Ecclesia*, as it was termed, was placed in the library of Cæsarea of Palestine. Probably no copy of it was ever taken; the labour was too great. It was seen, or at least quoted, by many; such as Pamphylus the Martyr, Eusebius, S. Athanasius, Didymus, S. Hilary, S. Eusebius of Vercelli, S. Epiphanius, S. Basil, S. Gregory Nyssen, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, and especially S. Jerome and Theodoret. It perished in the sack of Cæsarea by the



Persians, or the Arabs, before the end of the seventh century.\*

We need not say much here about the Tetrapla. Its origin appears to have been as follows:—When the Hexapla was completed, or nearly completed, it was evident that it was too bulky to be copied. Origen, therefore, superintended the production of an abridgement of it. He omitted the two columns of Hebrew, the great stumbling-block to copyists, and suppressed some of his notes. He then transcribed Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, putting his amended version of the Septuagint, without the marks and signs, just before the last. The two first answered the purposes of a Hebrew text, the last was a sort of connecting link between it and the freedom of the Septuagint; and so, for all practical purposes, he had a version that friends might put their trust in, and that enemies could not dispute.

Such was the work that Origen did for the Bible. It was not all done at once, in a year, or in ten years. It was begun almost without a distinct conception of what it would one day grow to. It progressed gradually, in the midst of many cares and much other labour, and it was barely completed when its architect's busy life was drawing to a close. Every one of those twenty years at Alexandria, which we are now dwelling upon, must have seen the work going on. The seven shorthand writers, and the seven young maidens who copied out, were Origen's daily attendants, as he seems to say himself. But the catechetical school was in full vigour all this time. Indeed, the critical fixing of the Bible-text, wonderful as it was, was only the material part of his work. He had to preach the Bible, not merely to write it out. His preaching will take us to a new scene and to new circumstances—to Cæsarea, where the greater part of his homilies were delivered. But before we accompany him thither, we must take a glance at his school at Alexandria, and try to realize how he spoke and taught. We have already described his manner of life, and the description of his Biblical labours will have given some idea of a very important part of his daily work; what we have now to do is to supplement this by the picture of him as the head of the great catechetical school.

---

\* A new edition of the fragments of the *Hexapla* is announced, as we write, by Mr. Field, of Norwich. The first instalment of this important work, for which there are now many more materials than Dom Montfaucon had at command, may be expected almost as we go to press. The editor's new sources are chiefly the recently discovered Sinaitic MSS., and the Syro-Hexaplar version, part of which he has lately re-translated into Greek in a very able manner, by way of a specimen.

One of the most striking characteristics of the career of Origen, is the way in which his work grew upon him. It is, indeed, a feature in the lives of all the great geniuses who have served the Church and lived in her fold, that they have achieved greatness by an apparently unconscious following of the path of duty rather than by any brilliant excursion under the guidance of ambition. Origen was the very opposite of a proud philosopher, or self-appointed dogmatizer. He did not come to his task with the consciousness that he was the man of his age, and that he was born to set right the times. We have seen his birth and bringing up, we have seen how he found himself in the important place that he held, and we have seen how all his success seemed to come to him whilst he was merely bent on carrying through with the utmost industry the affair that had been placed in his hands. We have seen that, so far was he from trying to fit the Gospel to the exigencies of a cramped philosophy, that he was brought up and passed part of his youth without any special acquaintance with philosophy or philosophers. He found, however, on resuming his duties as Catechist, that if he wished to do all the good that offered itself to his hand, he must make himself more intimate with those great minds who, erring as he knew them to be, yet influenced so much of what was good and noble in heathenism. At that very time, a movement, perhaps a resurrection, was taking place in Gentile philosophy. A teacher, brilliant as Plato himself, and with secrets to develop that Plato had only dreamt of, was in possession of the lecture-hall of the Museum. Ammonius Saccas had landed at Alexandria as a common porter; nothing but uncommon energy and extraordinary talents can have given him a position in the University and a place in history, as the teacher of the philosophic Trinity and the real founder of Neo-Platonism. Origen, to whom the Museum had been strange ground in his early youth, saw himself compelled to frequent it at the age of thirty. Saccas, to be sure, was probably a Christian of some sort. At any rate, the Christian teacher went and heard him, and made himself acquainted with what it was that was charming the ears of his fellow-citizens, and furnishing ground for half of the objections and difficulties that his catechumens and would-be converts brought to him for solution. That the influence of these studies is seen in his writings is not to be denied. It would be impossible for any mind but the very dullest to touch the spirit of Plato and not to be impressed and affected. The writings of Origen at this period include three philosophical works. There is first the "Notes on the Philosophers," which is entirely lost. We may suppose it to

have been the common-place book wherein was entered what he learnt from his teacher, and what he thought of the teacher and the doctrine. Then there is the *Stromata* (a work of the same nature as the *Stromata* of his master, S. Clement), whose leading idea was the great master-idea of Clement, that Plato and Aristotle and the rest were all partially right, but had failed to see the whole truth, which can only be known by revelation. This work, also, is lost—all but a fragment or two. Thirdly, there is the celebrated work, *Περὶ ἀρχῶν*, or *De Principiis*. Eusebius tells us expressly that this work was written at Alexandria. Most unfortunately, we have this treatise, not in the original, but in two rival and contradictory Latin versions, one by S. Jerome, the other by Rufinus. Both profess to be faithful renderings of a Greek original, and on the decision as to which version is the genuine translation, depends in great measure the question of Origen's orthodoxy or heterodoxy. And yet this treatise, *De Principiis*, much as it has been abused, from Marcellus of Ancyra down to the last French author who copied out Dom Ceillier, and waiving the discussion of certain particular opinions that we may have yet to advert to, seems to us to bear the stamp of Origen on every page. It is such a work as a man would have written who had come fresh from an exposition of deep heathen philosophy, and who felt, with feelings too deep for expression, that all the beauty and depth of the philosophy he had heard, were over-matched a thousand times by the philosophy of Jesus Christ. It is the first specimen, in Christian literature, of a regular scientific treatise on the *principles* of Christianity. Every one knows that a discussion on the principles or sources of the world, of man, of life, was one of the commonest shapes of controversy between the schools of philosophy; and at that very time, the great Longinus, who probably sat beside Origen in the school of Ammonius Saccas, was writing or thinking out a treatise with the very title of that of Origen. It was a natural idea, therefore, to show his scholars that he could give them better *principia* than the heathens. The treatise takes no notice, or next to none, of heathen philosophy and its disputes; but it travels over well-known ground, and what is more it provokes comparison in a very significant manner. For instance, the words wherewith it commences are words which Plato introduces in the *Gorgias*; and to those who knew that elaborate Dialogue, the sudden and unhesitating introduction of the name of Christ, and the calm position that He and none else is the Truth, and that in Him is the science of the good and happy life, must have been quite as striking as its author

probably intended it to be. The treatise is not in the Platonic form—the dialogue; that form, which was suitable to the days of the Sophists and the sharp-tongued Athenians, had been superseded at Alexandria by the ornate monologue, more suitable to an audience of novices and wonderers. Origen adopts this form. One God made all things, Himself a pure spirit; there is a Trinity of Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; of the rational creatures of God, some fell irremediably, others fell not at all; others again—that is, the race of man—fell, but not irremediably, having a Mediator in Jesus Christ, being assisted by the good angels and persecuted by the bad; the wonderful fact that the Word was made Flesh; man's free will, eternal punishment and eternal reward; such are the heads of the subjects treated of in the *De Principiis*. The lame and disjointed condition of the present text is evident on a very cursory examination; it is perfectly unworthy of the *contra Celsum*. But the reader who studies the text carefully, by the light of contemporary thought, can hardly help thinking that materials so solid and good must have been put together in a form as satisfactory and as conclusive. A first attempt in any science is always more admired for its genius than criticised for its faults. This of Origen's was a first attempt towards a scientific theology. We say a theology, not a philosophy; for, though philosophic in form, and accepted as philosophy by his hearers, it is wholly theological in matter, being founded on the continual word of Holy Scripture, and not unfrequently undertaking to refute heresy. Christianity, as we have before observed, was looked upon by strangers as a philosophy, and its doctors rightly allowed them to think so, and even called it so themselves. Now the *De Principiis* was Origen's philosophy of Christianity. It did not prove, so much as draw out into system. It answered all the questions of the day. What is God? asked the philosophers. He is the Creator of all things, and a pure spirit, answered the Christian catechist. Is not this Trinity a wonderful idea? said the young students to each other, after hearing Saccas. Christianity, said Origen, teaches a Trinity far more awful and wonderful, and far more reasonable, too—a Trinity, not of ideas, but of Persons. The new school talked of the inferior gods that ruled the lower world, and of the demons, good and bad, who executed their behests. The Christian philosopher explained the great fact of creation, and laid down the true doctrine of guardian angels and tempting devils. The constitution of man was another puzzle; the rebellion of the passions, the nature of sin, the question of free-will. Plotinus, who listened to Saccas at the same time

as Origen, has left us the attempts at the solution of these difficulties that were accepted in the school of his master; the answers of Origen may be read in the *De Principiis*. The earnest among the heathen philosophers were totally in the dark as to the state of soul and of body after death. Some were ashamed of having a body at all, and few of them could see of what use it was, or how it could subserve the great end of arriving at union with God. Origen dwells with marked emphasis, and with tender lingering, on the great key of mysteries, the Incarnation, and its consequence, the resurrection of the flesh; and shows how the body is to be kept down in this life by the rational will, that it too may have its glory in the life to come. The whole effort and striving of Neo-Platonism was to enable the soul to be united with the Divinity. Origen accepted this; it was the object of the Christian philosophy as well; but he drew into prominence two all-important facts—first, the necessity of the grace of God; secondly, the moral and not physical nature of the purification of the soul; together with the Christian dogma that it was only after death that perfect union could take place. All this must have been perfectly fitted to the time and the occasion. And yet there are evident signs that it was not delivered or written as a manifesto to the frequenters of the Museum; it was evidently meant as an instruction to the upper class of the catechetical school. Its author's first idea was that he was a Christian teacher, and he spoke to Christians who believed the Holy Scriptures. What his words might do for others he was not directly concerned with, but there is no doubt that the subjects treated of in the *De Principiis* must have been discussed over and over again with those students and philosophers from the University, who, as Eusebius tells us, flocked to hear him in such numbers, and also with that large class of Christians who still retained their love of scientific learning, though believing most firmly in the faith of Jesus Christ.

Of the matter of his ordinary catechetical instructions we need say little, because it is evident that it would be mainly the same as it has been under the like circumstances in all ages. Those of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, delivered a century later, may furnish us with a good idea of them, saving where doctrinal distinctions are discussed which had not arisen in the time of the elder teacher. It is rather extraordinary that so little trace has reached us of any formal catechetical discourse of Origen. We are inclined to think, however, that the *De Principiis*, in its *original* form, must have been the summary or embodiment of his periodical instruc-

tions. But we have numerous hints at what he taught in the several works on Holy Scripture, some lost, some still partly extant, which he composed during these twenty years at Alexandria. It appears that he was in the habit of writing three different kinds of commentary on the Scriptures; first, brief comments or notices, such as he has left in the Hexapla; secondly, scholia, or explanations of some length; and thirdly, regular homilies. But his homilies belong to a later period. At Alexandria he commented S. John's Gospel (a labour that occupied him all his life), Genesis, several of the Psalms, and the Canticle of Canticles, a celebrated work, yet extant in a Latin version, of which it has been said, that whereas in his other commentaries he excelled all other interpreters, in this he excelled himself. But the whole interesting subject of his creation of Scripture-commenting must be treated of when we follow him to Cæsarea, and listen to him preaching.

What we desire now, to complete our idea of his Alexandrian career, and of what we may call the inner life of his teaching, is, that some one—a contemporary and a scholar, if possible—should describe his method and manner, and let us know how he treated his hearers and how they liked him. Fortunately the very witness and document that we want is ready to our hands. One of the most famous of Origen's scholars was S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, and the most interesting of the extant works of that father is undoubtedly the discourse and panegyric which he pronounced upon his master, on the occasion of bidding farewell to his school. Gregory, or, as he was then called, Theodore, and his brother Athenodorus, were of a noble and wealthy family of Cappadocia; that is to say, probably, descendants of Greek colonists of the times of the Alexandrian conquests, though, no doubt, with much Syrian blood in their veins. When Gregory was fourteen they lost their father, and the two wealthy young orphans were left to the care of their mother. Under her guidance they were educated according to their birth and position, and in a few years began to study for the profession of public speakers. As they would have plenty of money it mattered little what they took to; but the profession of an orator was something like what the bar is now, and gave a man an education that would be useful if he required it, and ornamental whether he required it or not. The best judges pronounced that the young men would soon be finished *rhetores*: S. Gregory tells us so, but will not say whether he thinks their opinion right, and before proof could be made the two youths had been persuaded by a master they were very fond of to take up the study of Roman jurisprudence. Berytus, a city of Phœnicia, better known to the modern world



as Beyrout, had just then attained that great eminence as a school for Roman law which it preserved for nigh three centuries. Thither the young Cappadocians were to go. Their master had taught them what he could, and wished either to accompany them to the law-university or to send them thither to be finished and perfected. It does not appear, however, that they ever really got there. Most biographies of S. Gregory say that they studied there; what S. Gregory himself says is, that they were on their way thither, but that, having to pass through Cæsarea (of Palestine), they met with Origen, to whom they took so great an affection that he converted them to Christianity and kept them by him there and at Alexandria for five years. The *Oratio Panegyrica* was delivered at Cæsarea, and after the date of Origen's twenty years as catechist at Alexandria; but it will be readily understood that the whole spirit, and, indeed, the whole details, of the composition are as applicable to Alexandria as to Cæsarea; for his teaching work was precisely of the same nature at the latter city as at the former, with a trifling difference in his position. The oration of S. Gregory is a formal and solemn effort of rhetoric, spoken at some public meeting, perhaps in the school, in the presence of learned men and of fellow-students, and of the master himself. It is written very elegantly and eloquently, but it is in a style that we should call young, did we not know that to make parade of apophthegms and weighty sayings, to moralize rather too much, to pursue metaphors unnecessarily, and to beat about a thing with words so as to do everything but say it, was the characteristic of most orators, old and young, from the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus till the days when oratory, as a profession, expired before anarchy and the barbarians. But its literary merits, though great, are the least of its recommendations. Its value as a theological monument is shown by the appeals made to it in the controversy against Arius, and in more recent times Bishop Bull, for instance, has made great use of it in his *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*. To us, at present, its most important service is the light it sheds upon the teaching of Origen. We need make no apology for making S. Gregory the type of the Alexandrian or Cæsarean scholar; they may not have been all like him, but one real living specimen will tell us more than much abstract description.

First of all, then, the Scholar was not of an emphatically philosophic cast of mind. The Greek philosophers were absolutely unknown to him. He was a rich and clever young man, bade fair to be a good speaker, studied the law, not because he liked it, but because his friends and his master wished it;

thought the Latin language very imperial, but *very* difficult; and had a habit of taking up what opinions he did adopt more after the manner of clothes that he could change as he pleased than as immutable truths. He was of a warm and affectionate disposition, and had a keen appreciation of physical and moral beauty. He was not without leanings to Christianity, but he leaned to it in an easy off-hand sort of way, as he might have leaned to a new school in poetry, or a new style of dress. He had no idea that there is such a thing as the absolutely right and the absolutely wrong in ethics any more than in taste. He was confirmed in this state of mind by the philosophic schools of the day, among whom it was considered disreputable to change one's opinions, however good the reasons for a change might be; which was to degrade philosophy from truth to the mere spirit of party, and to make a philosopher not a lover of wisdom but a volunteer of opinion. So prepared and constituted, the scholar, on his way to Berytus, fell in with Origen, not so much by accident as by the disposition of Providence and the guidance of his angel guardian; so at least he thought himself. The first process which he went through at the hands of the master is compared by the scholar to the catching of a beast, or a bird, or a fish, in a net. Philosophizing had small charms for the accomplished young man; to philosophize was precisely what the master had determined he should do. We must remember the meaning of the word *φιλοσοφεῖν*; it meant to think, act, and *live* as a man who seeks true wisdom. All the sects acknowledge this theoretically; what Clement and Origen wanted to show, among other things, was that only a Christian was a true philosopher in practice. Hence the net he spread for Theodore, a net of words, strong and not to be broken. "You are a fine and clever young man," he seemed to say; "but to what purpose are your accomplishments and your journeys hither and thither? you cannot answer me the simple question, Who are you? You are going to study the laws of Rome, but should you not first have some definite notion as to your last end, as to what is real evil and what is real good? You are looking forward to enjoyment from your wealth, and honour from your talents; why, so does every poor, sordid, creeping mortal on the earth; so even do the brute beasts. Surely the divine gift of reason was given you to help you to live to some higher end than this." The scholar hesitated, the master insisted. The view was striking in itself, but the teacher's personal gifts made it strike far more effectually. "He was a mixture," says the scholar, "of geniality, persuasiveness, and compulsion. I wanted to go away, but could not; his words held me like a

cord." The young man, unsettled as his mind had been, yet had always at heart believed in some sort of Divine Being. Origen completed the conquest of his intellect by showing him that without philosophy, that is, without correct views on morality, the worship of God, or *piety*, as it used to be called, is impossible. And yet wisdom and eloquence might have been thrown away, here as in so many other cases, had not another influence, imperious and all-powerful, been all this time rising up in his heart. The scholar began to love the master. It was not an ordinary love, the love with which Origen inspired his hearers. It was an intense, almost a fierce, love (we are almost translating the words of the original), a fitting response to the genuineness and kindly spirit of one who seemed to think no pains or kindness too great to win the young heart to true morality, and thereby to the worship of the only God, "to that saving word," says S. Gregory, in his lofty style, "which alone can teach God-service, which to whomsoever it comes home it makes a conquest of them; and this gift God seems to have given to him, beyond all men now in the world." To that sacred and lovely Word, therefore, and to the man who was its interpreter and its friend, sprang up in the heart of the scholar a deep, inextinguishable love. For that he abandoned pursuits and studies which he had hitherto considered indispensable; for that he left the "grand" laws of Rome, and forsook the friends he had left at home, and the friends that were then at his side. "And the soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David," quotes the scholar, noting that the text speaks emphatically of the union of the soul, which no earthly accidents can affect, and finding a parallel to himself in Jonathan, to his master in David, the wise, the holy, and the strong. And though the hour for parting had come, the moment when these bonds of the soul should be severed would never come!

The scholar was now completely in the hands of his teacher, "as a land," he says, "empty, unproductive, and the reverse of fertile, saline" (like the waste lands near the Nile), "burnt up, stony, drifted with sand; yet not absolutely barren, nay, with qualities which might be worth cultivating; but which had hitherto been left without tillage or care, to be overgrown with thorn and thicket." He can hardly make enough of this metaphor of land and cultivation to show the nature of the work that the teacher had with his mind. We have to read on for some time before we find out that all this vigorous grubbing, ploughing, harrowing, and sowing, represents the dialectical training which Origen gave his pupils, such pupils,

at least, as those of whom Gregory Thaumaturgus was the type. In fact, the Dialectics of the Platonists and their offshoots is very inadequately represented by the modern use of the word Logic. It seems to have signified, as nearly as a short definition can express it, the rectifying the ideas of the mind about itself, and about those things most intimately connected with it. A modern student takes up his manual of logic, or sits down in his class-room with his most important ideas, either correct and settled, or else incorrect beyond the cure of logic. At Alexandria manuals were scarce, and the ideas of the converts from heathenism were so utterly and fundamentally confused, that the first lessons of the Christian teacher to an educated Greek or Syrian, necessarily took the shape of a Socratic discussion, or a disquisition on principles. And so the scholar, not without much amazement and ruffling of the feelings, found the field of his mind unceremoniously cleared out, broken up, and freshly-planted. But, the process once complete, the result was worth the inconvenience.

It was about this stage also that the master insisted on a special training in natural history and mathematics. In his youth Origen had been educated, as we have seen, by his father in the whole circle of the sciences of the day. Such an education was possible then, though impossible now, and the spirit of Alexandrian teaching was especially attached to the sciences that regarded numbers, the figure of the earth and nature. The schools of the Greek philosophers had always tolerated these sciences in their own precincts; nay, most of the schools themselves had arisen from attempts made in the direction of those very sciences, and few of them had attempted to distinguish accurately between physics and metaphysics. Moreover, geography, astronomy, and geometry, were the peculiar property of the museum, for Eratosthenes, Euclid, Hipparchus, and Ptolemy himself, had observed and taught within its walls. Origen, therefore, would not be likely to undervalue those interesting sciences which he had studied with his father, and which nine out of ten of his educated catechumens were more or less acquainted, and puzzled, or delighted with. Happy days when mathematics was little and chemistry in its infancy, when astronomy lived shut up in a tower, clad in mystic vesture, and when geology was yet in the womb of its mother earth! Envious times when they all (such at least as were born) could be sufficiently attended to and provided for in a casual paragraph of a theological instruction, or brought into a philosophical discussion to be admired and dismissed! Origen, however, had, as usual, a deeper motive for bringing physics and mathematics into his

system. We need not remind the reader that, if Plato can be considered to have a weak part, that part is where he goes into Pythagorean speculations about bodies, numbers, and regular solids. His revivers, about the time we are speaking of, had, with the usual instinct of revivers, found out his weak part, and made the most of it, as if it had been the sublimest evolution of his genius. We may guess what was taking place from what afterwards did take place, when even Porphyry fluctuated all his life between pretensions to philosophy and, what S. Augustine calls, "sacrilegious curiosity," and when the whimsical triads of poor old Proclus were powerless to stop the deluge of theurgy, incantations, and all superstitions that finally swamped Neo-Platonism for ever. With this view present to our minds the words of the scholar in this place are very significant, "by these two studies, geometry and astronomy, he made us a path towards heaven." The three words that S. Gregory uses in the description of this part of the master's teaching are worth noticing. The first is Geometry, which is taken to mean everything that relates to the earth's surface. The second is Astronomy, which treats of the face of the heavens. The third is Physiology, which is the science of nature, or of all that comes between heaven and earth. So that Origen's scientific teaching was truly encyclopædic. He was, moreover, an experimental philosopher, and did not merely retail the theories of others. He analyzed things and resolved them into their elements (their "very first" elements, says the scholar); he descanted on the multi-form changes and conversions of things, partly from his own discoveries, and gave his hearers a rational admiration for the sacredness and perfection of nature, instead of a blind and stupid bewilderment; he "carved on their minds geometry the unquestionable, so dear to all, and astronomy that searches the upper air." What were the precise details of his teachings on these subjects it would be unfair to ask, even if it were possible to answer. We know that he thought diamonds and precious stones were formed from dew; but this is no proof he was behind his age, and his acquaintance with the literature of the subject proves he was, if anything, before it. With regard to naphtha, the magnet, and the looking-glass, it will be pleasing to know he was substantially right. He was, perhaps, the first to make a spiritual use of the accepted notion that the serpent was powerless against the stag; the reason is, he says, that the stag is the type of Christ warring against Anti-Christ. That he believed in griffins is unfortunate, but natural in an Alexandrian, who had lived in an atmosphere of stories brought down from the Upper Nile by the ingenious

sailors. As to his "denying the existence of the *Tragelaphus*," we must remain ignorant whether it redounds to his credit or otherwise, until modern researches have exhausted the African continent.

The scholar next comes to the more strictly ethical part of Origen's teaching. The preliminary dialectics had cleared the ground, and to a certain extent replanted it; physics made the process more easy, pleasant, and complete; but the great end of a philosophic life was Ethics, that is, the making a man good. The making of a man good and virtuous seems now-a-days a simple matter, as far as theory is concerned, and so perhaps it is, if only theory and principles be considered; though morality is an extensive science and one that is not mastered in an hour or a day. But in Origen's day a science of Christian ethics did not exist. The teaching of the Scripture and the voice of the pastors was sufficient, doubtless, for the guidance of the faithful; but science is a different thing. Such a science is shadowed out to us by the scholar in the record we are noticing. S. Thomas, the great finisher of scientific Christian ethics, embraces all virtues under two great classes, viz., the theological and the cardinal. The whole science of morality treats only of the seven virtues included under these two divisions. The master's teaching comprehended, of course, Faith, and Hope, and Charity; indeed, it would be more correct to say that these three virtues were his whole ultimate object; but the scholar says little of them in particular just because of this very reason, and also because they were bound up in that *Piety* which he mentions so often. But it is a most interesting fact that the virtues, and the only virtues, mentioned in the summary of Origen's moral teaching, given by S. Gregory, are precisely the four cardinal virtues, Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance. The classification dates, of course, from the Stoics, but the circumstance that the framework laid down by a father in the beginning of the third century was used and completed by another father in the thirteenth, gives the early father an undoubted claim to be considered the founder of Christian ethics. And here we lay our hands on one of the earliest instances of heathen philosophy being made to hew wood and carry water for Christian theology. The division of virtues was a good one; all the schools pretended to teach it; but the distinctive boast and triumph of the Christian teacher was that he taught *true* prudence, *true* justice, *true* fortitude, and *true* temperance, "not such," says the scholar, "as the other philosophers teach, and especially the moderns, who are strong and great in words; he not only talked about the virtues, but exhorted us to practise them;



and he exhorted us by what he did far more than by what he said." And here the scholar takes the opportunity of recording his opinion about "the other" philosophers, now that he has had a course of Origen's training. He first apologizes to them for hurting their feelings. He says that, personally, he has no ill-will against them, but he plainly tells them that things have come to such a pass, through their conduct, that the very name of philosophy is laughed at. And he goes on to develop what appeared to him the very essence of their faults, viz., too much talk, and nothing but talk. Their teaching is like a widely-extended morass; once set foot in it and you can neither get out nor go on, but stick fast till you perish. Or it is like a thick forest; the traveller who once finds himself in it has no chance of ever getting back to the open fields and the light of day, but gropes about backwards and forwards, first trying one path then another, and finding they all lead further in, until at last, wearied and desperate, he sits down and dwells in the forest, resolving that the forest shall be his world, since all the world seems to be a forest. This is, perhaps, one of the most graphic pictures ever given, of the state of mind, so artificial, so unsatisfied, and yet so self-sufficient, brought about by a specious heathen philosophy, and the effect of enlightened reason destitute of revelation. The scholar cannot heighten the strength of his description by going on to compare it, in the third place, to a labyrinth, but the comparison brings out two striking features well worthy of notice. The first is, the innocent and guileless look of the whole concern from the outside; "the traveller sees the open door and in he goes, suspecting nothing." Once in, he sees a great deal to admire (and this is the second point in the labyrinth-simile); he sees the very perfection of art and arrangement, doors after doors, rooms within rooms, passages leading most ingeniously and conveniently into other passages; he sees all this art, admires the architect, and—thinks of going out. But there is no going out for him; he is fast. All the artifice and ingenuity he has been admiring have been expended for the express purpose of keeping in for ever those foolish people who have been so unwary as to come in at the open door. "For there is no labyrinth so hard to thread," sums up the scholar, "no wood so deep and thick, no bog so false and hopeless as the language of some of these philosophers." In this language we recognize another of the characteristic feelings of the day,—the feeling of profound disgust for the highest teachings of heathenism from the moment the soul catches a ray of the light of the Gospel. In Origen's school the confines of the receding darkness skirted the

advancing kingdom of light, and those that sat in the darkness to-day saw it leaving them to-morrow, and far behind them the morrow after that; and all the time the great master had to be peering anxiously into the darkness to see what souls were nearest the light, and to hold out his hand to win them too into the company of those that were already sitting at his feet. In such days as those, sharp comparisons between heathen wisdom and the light of Christ must have been part of the atmosphere in which the catechumens of the great school lived and breathed; there was a reality and interest in them such as can never be again. And yet the master was no bigot in his dealings with the Greek philosophies. "He was the first and the only one," says his scholar, "that made me study the philosophy of Greece." The scholar was to reject nothing, to despise nothing, but make himself thoroughly acquainted with the whole range of Greek philosophy and poetry; there was only one class of writers he was to have nothing to do with, and those were the Atheists who denied God and God's providence; their books could only sully a mind that was striving after Piety. But his pupils were to attach themselves to no school or party, as did the mob of those who pretended to study philosophy. Under his guidance they were to take what was true and good, and leave what was false and bad. He walked beside them and in front of them through the labyrinth; he had studied its windings and knew its turns; in his company, and with their eyes on his "lofty and safe" teaching, his scholars need fear no danger.

This brief analysis of part of S. Gregory's remarkable oration will serve to give us some idea of Origen's method of treating his more learned and cultivated converts, of whom we know he had a very great many. It will also have admitted us, in some sort, into the interior of his school, and let us hear the question in debate and the matters that were of greatest interest in that most influential centre of Christian teaching. It does not, of course, deal directly with theology, or with those great controversies which Origen, in a manner, rendered possible for his pupils and successors of the next century. The scholar, indeed, does go on now to speak of his theological teachings; but he describes rather his manner than his matter, and rather the salient points of characteristic gifts than the details of his dogmatic system. As this is precisely our own object in these notes, we need only say that S. Gregory, in the concluding pages of his farewell discourse, sufficiently proves that the great end and object of all philosophic teaching and intellectual discipline in the

school of his master was faith and practical piety. To teach his hearers the great First Cause was his most careful and earnest task. His instructions about God were so full of knowledge and so carefully prepared that the scholar is at a loss how to describe them. His explanations of the Prophets, and of Holy Scripture generally, were so wonderful that he seemed to be the friend and interpreter of the Word. The soul that thirsted for knowledge went away from him refreshed, and the hard of heart and the unbelieving could not listen to him without both understanding, and believing, and making submission to God. "It was no otherwise than by the communication of the Holy Ghost that he spoke thus," says his disciple, "for the Prophets and the interpreters of the Prophets have necessarily the same help from above, and none can understand a prophet unless by the same spirit wherein the prophet spoke. This greatest of gifts and this splendid destiny he seemed to have received from God, that he should be the interpreter of God's words to men, that he should understand the things of God, as though he heard them from God's own mouth, and that through him men should be brought to listen and obey." Two little indications of what we may call the spirit of Origen are to be found in this address of his pupil. The first is the great value he sets upon purity as the only means of arriving at the knowledge and communion of God. We know what a watchword this "union with God" was among the popular philosophers of the day. To attain to it was the end of all the Neo-Platonic asceticism. It was Origen's great end as well; but he taught that purity alone and the subjugation of the passions by the grace of God will avail to lead the soul thither, and that no amount of external refinement or abstinence from gross sin will suffice to make the soul pure in the sight of God. The second is, his devotion to the person of the Son, the ever-blessed Word of God. The whole oration of the scholar takes the form of a thanksgiving to "the Master and Saviour of our souls, the first-born Word, the Maker and Ruler of all things." He never misses an opportunity all through it of bursting into eloquent love to that "Prince of the universe;" he cannot praise his master without first praising Him, or ascribe anything to the powers of the earthly teacher without referring it first of all to the heavenly Giver. He had learnt this from Origen, the predecessor, unconsciously certainly, but in will and in spirit, of another Alexandrian, the great Athanasius. And here again error was bringing out the truth, for unless the Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists had been at that very time theorizing about their demiurge and their emanations, we should probably have

missed the tender devotion and repeated homage to the Eternal Word, which we find in the words of Origen and his disciple.

Theodore, or Gregory, as he had been named in baptism, had to thank his master and to praise him, and he had, moreover, to say how sorry he was to leave him. He concludes his speech with the expression of his regrets. He is afraid that all the grand teaching he has received has been to a great extent thrown away upon him. He is not yet prudent, he is not just, he is not temperate, he has no fortitude; alas, for his own native imbecility! But one gift the master has given him; he has made him love all these virtues with a love that knows no bounds; and he has made him love, over and above them all, that virtue which is alike their beginning and their consummation—the blessed virtue of piety, the service and love of God. And now, in leaving him, he seems to be leaving a garden full of useful trees and pleasant fruits, full of green grass and cheering sunshine. And he thereupon compares himself, at considerable length, to our first parents banished from Paradise. “I am leaving the face of God and going back to the earth from whence I came; and I shall eat earth all my days, and till earth,—an earth that will produce me nothing but thorns and briars now that it is deprived of its good and excellent tending.” He goes on to liken himself to the prodigal son; and yet he finds himself worse than he, for he is going away without receiving the due “portion of substance,” and leaving behind everything he loves and cares for. Again, he seems to be one of that band of Jewish captives that hung up their harps on the willows and wept beside the rivers of Babylon. “I am going out from my Jerusalem,” he says, “my holy city, where day and night the holy law is being announced, where are hymns and canticles and mystic speech; where a light brighter than the sun shines upon us as we discuss the mysteries of God, and where our fancy brings back in the night visions of what has occupied us in the day; I am leaving this holy city, wherein God seems to breathe everywhere, and going into a land of exile: there will be no singing for me; even the mournful flute will not be my solace when my harp is hung on the willows; but I shall be working by river-sides and making bricks; the hymns I remember I shall not be allowed to sing; nay, it may be that my very memory will play me false, and my hard work will make me forget them.” The youthful heart, that has left a cloistered retreat of learning and piety, where masters have been loved, studies enjoyed, and God tenderly served, will test these words by itself, and read in

their eloquent painting another proof that nature is the same to-day as yesterday. Gregory the wonderworker was truly a scholar to be proud of, but the master's pride must have been obliterated in his emotion when he listened to such a description of his school as this.

But the scholar, after all, will leave with a good heart. "There is the Word, the sleepless guardian of all men." He puts his trust in Him, and in the good seed that his master has sown; perhaps he may come back again and see him yet once more, when the seed shall have sprung up and produced such fruits as can be expected from a nature which is barren and evil, but which he prays God may never become worse by his own fault. "And do thou, O my beloved master (ὦ φίλη κεφαλὴ), arise and send us forth with thy prayer; thou hast been our saviour by thy holy teachings whilst we were with thee; save us still by thy prayers when we depart. Give us back, O master, give us up into the hands of Him that sent us to thee, God; thank Him for what has befallen us; pray Him that in the future He may ever be with us to direct us, that He may keep His laws before our eyes and set in our heart that best of teachers, His divine fear. Away from thee, we shall not obey Him as freely as we obeyed Him here. Keep praying that we may find consolation in Him for our loss of thee, that He may send us His angel to go with us; and ask Him to bring us back to thee once more; no other consolation could be half so great." And so they depart, the two brothers, never again to see their master more. They both became great bishops, Gregory the greatest; we find Origen writing to him, soon after his departure, a letter full of affection and good counsel; and who can tell how much the teaching of the Catechist of Alexandria had to do with that wonderful life and never-dying reputation that distinguish Gregory Thaumaturgus among all the saints of the Church?

Origen presided at Alexandria for twenty years—that is to say, from 211 to 231. In the latter year he left it for ever. During this period he had been temporarily absent more than once. The governor of the Roman Arabia, or Arabia Petræa, had sent a special messenger to the Prefect of Alexandria and the Patriarch, to beg that the Catechist might pay him a visit. What he wanted him for is not recorded; but Petra, the capital of the Roman province, was not so far from the great road between Alexandria and Palestine, as to be out of the way of Greek thought and civilization, and its interesting remains of art, belonging to this very period, which startled modern travellers only a short time past, prove that it was itself no inconsiderable centre of intellectual cultivation.

We may, therefore, conjecture that his errand was philosophical, or, in other words, religious.

The second time that Origen was absent from Alexandria was for a somewhat longer space. The emperor Caracalla, after murdering his brother and indulging in indiscriminate slaughter, in all parts of the world from Rome to Syria, had at last arrived, with his troubled conscience and his well-bribed legions, at Alexandria. The Alexandrians, it is well known, had an irresistible tendency to give nicknames. Caracalla's career was open to a few epithets, and the unfortunate "men of Macedon" made merry on some salient points in the character of the emperor and his mother. They had better have held their tongues, or plucked them out; for in a fury of vengeance he let loose his blood-thirsty bands on the city. How many were slain in that awful visitation no one ever knew; the dead were thrown into trenches, and hastily covered up, uncounted and unrecorded. The spectre-haunted emperor took special vengeance on the institutions and professors of learning. It would seem that he destroyed a great part of the buildings of the Museum, and put to death or banished the teachers. As for the students, he had the whole youth of the city driven together into the Gymnasium, and ordered them to be formed into a "Macedonian phalanx" for his army—a grim retort, in kind, for their pleasantries at his expense. Origen fled before this storm. Had he remained, he was far too well known now to have been safe for an hour. Doubtless obedience made him conceal himself and escape. He took refuge in Cæsarea of Palestine, where the bishop, S. Theoctistus, received him with the utmost honour; and, though he was yet only a layman, made him preach in the church, which he had never done at Alexandria. When the tempest in Egypt had gone by, Demetrius wrote for him to come back. He returned, and resumed the duties of his post.

After this he took either one or two other journeys. He was sent into Greece, and visited Athens, with letters from his bishop, to refute heresy and confirm the Christian religion. He also stayed awhile at the great central see of Antioch.

On his journey to Greece, he had been ordained priest at Cæsarea, by his friend S. Theoctistus. When he returned to Alexandria, about the year 231, Demetrius, the patriarch, was pleased to be exceedingly indignant at his ordination. We cannot go into the controversy here; we need only say that a synod of bishops, summoned by the patriarch, decreed that he must leave Alexandria, but retain his priesthood; which seems to show that they thought he had better leave



for the sake of peace, though they could not recognize any canonical fault; for if they had, they would have suspended or degraded him. Demetrius, indeed, assembled another synod some time later, and did degrade and excommunicate him. But by this time Origen had left Alexandria, never to return, and was quietly living at Cæsarea. We dare not pronounce sentence in a cause that has occupied so many learned pens; but we dare confidently say this, that it is impossible to prove Origen to have been knowingly in the wrong. We must now follow him to Cæsarea.

If some Levantine merchantman, manned by swarthy Greeks or Syrians, in trying to make Beyrout, should be driven by a north wind some fifty miles further along the coast to the south-west, she might possibly find herself, at break of day, in sight of a strange-looking harbour. There would be a wide semi-circular sweep of buildings, or what had once been buildings; there would be a southern promontory, crowned with a tower in ruins; there would be the vestiges of a splendid pier; and there would be rows of granite pillars lying as if a hurricane had come off the land, and blown them bodily into the sea. An Arab or two, in their white cotton clothes, would be grimly looking about them, on some prostrate columns; and a stray jackal, caught by the rising sun, would be scampering into some hole in the ruins. Our merchantman would have come upon all that is left of Cæsarea of Palestine. If she did not immediately make all sail to Jaffa, or back to Beyrout, it would not be because the place does not look ghostly and dismal enough. And yet it was once the greatest port on that Mediterranean coast, and far more important than either Jaffa, Acre, Sidon, or even Beyrout now. It owed its celebrity to Herod the Great. Twelve years of labour, and the expenditure of vast sums of money, made the ancient *Turris Stratonis* worthy to be re-christened *Cæsarea*, in honour of *Cæsar Augustus*. Its great pier, constructed of granite blocks of incredible size, afforded at once dwelling-places and hostelries for the sailors, and a splendid columned promenade for the wealthy citizens. The half-circle of buildings, all of polished granite, that embraced the sea and the harbour, and terminated in a rocky promontory on either side, shone far out to sea, and showed conspicuous in the midst the great temple of *Cæsar*, crowned with statues of *Augustus* and of the Roman city. An agora, a prætorium, a circus looking out to sea, and a rock-hewn theatre, were included in Herod's magnificent plans, and fittingly adorned a city that was to become in a few years the capital of Palestine. We see its importance even as early as the days immediately after

Pentecost. It was here that the Gentiles were called to the faith, in the person of Cornelius the centurion, a commander of the legionaries stationed at Cæsarea. His house, three hundred years later, was turned into a chapel by S. Paulo, and must therefore have been recognizable at the time of which we write. It was here that Herod Agrippa I. planned the apprehension of S. Peter and the execution of S. James the Greater; and it was in the theatre here that the beams of the sun shone upon his glittering apparel, and the people saluted him as a god, only to see him smitten by the hand of the true God, and carried to his palace in the agonies of mortal pain. S. Paul was here several times, and last of all when he was brought from Jerusalem by the fifty horsemen and the two hundred spearmen. Here he was examined before Felix, and before Festus, in the presence of King Agrippa, when he made his celebrated speech; and it was from the harbour of Cæsarea that he sailed for Rome to be heard before Cæsar. For many centuries, even into the times of the Crusaders, it continued to be a capital and haven of great importance. Between 195 and 198, it was the scene of one of the earliest councils of the Eastern Church, and, as the see of Eusebius the founder of Church history, and the site of a celebrated library, it must always be interesting in ecclesiastical annals. But perhaps it would require nothing more to make it a place of note in our eyes than the fact that when Origen was driven from Alexandria, in 231, he transferred to Cæsarea not the Alexandrian school, it is true, but the teacher whose presence and spirit had contributed so much to make it immortal.

Cæsarea, indeed, was at that time a literary centre only second to Alexandria or Antioch. It was in direct communication with Jerusalem by an excellent military road, and with Alexandria by a road that was longer indeed, but in no way inferior. It was not far from Berytus both by land and sea. Like Capharnaum and Ptolemais, but in a yet higher degree, it was one of Herod the Great's model cities, in which he had embodied his scheme of *Grecianizing* his country by the influence of splendid Greek art and overpowering Greek intellect. It was also the metropolis of Palestine. S. Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, Origen's fellow-student, was the intimate friend of Theoctistus, Bishop of Cæsarea; and it is clear that bishops, or their messengers, from the cities all along the coast, as far as Antioch, and even the distant Cappadocia and Pontus, were not unfrequent visitors to this great rallying-point of the Church and the empire.

When Origen, therefore, left Alexandria and took up his abode in a city that was in a manner the diminished counter-

part of the one he had abandoned, he did not find himself in a strange land. S. Theoctistus received him with delight. It was not long before he journeyed the short distance to Jerusalem, to renew his acquaintance with S. Alexander; and these two Bishops were only too glad to put on his shoulders all the charges that he would accept. "They referred to him," says Eusebius, "on every occasion as their master; they committed to him alone the charge of interpreting and teaching holy Scripture and everything connected with preaching the Word of God in the church." From the way in which the historian joins the two Bishops together, it would appear that Cæsarea was a common school for the two dioceses, and a sort of ecclesiastical seminary whither the clerics from Jerusalem came, as to a centre where learning and learned men would abound more than in ruined and fallen *Ælia*. It is certain, however, that Origen, in a short time, was teaching and writing as fast as at Alexandria. His name soon began to draw scholars. Firmilian, bishop of so distant a see as Cæsarea of Cappadocia, one of the most stirring minds of his age, who had controversies on his hands all round the sea-coast to Carthage in one direction, and Rome in the other, was a friend of Theoctistus. It is possible that he knew Origen also, perhaps from having seen him at Alexandria, but more probably from having met him when Origen travelled into Greece. At any rate, he conceived an enthusiastic liking for him. Nothing would serve him but to make Origen travel to his own far-off province to teach and stimulate pastors and people; and, not long afterwards, we find himself in Judæa, that is at Cæsarea, on a visit to Origen, with whom he is stated to have remained "some time" for the sake of "bettering himself" in divinity. And, as Eusebius sums up, "not only those who lived in the same part of the world, but very many others from distant lands, left their country and came flocking to listen to him." We need not mention here again the names Gregory and Athenodorus.

The position now occupied by Origen at Cæsarea was, therefore, one of the highest importance. He was no longer a private teacher, or even an authorized master teaching in private; he was no less than the substitute for the Bishop himself. In the Eastern Church, indeed, the custom by which no one but the Bishop ever preached in the church was not so strictly observed as it was in the West; but if a presbyter did receive the commission of preaching, it was always with the understanding that what he said was said on behalf of the Pontiff, whose presence in his chair was a guarantee for its orthodoxy. When Origen, therefore, on the Lord's day,

after the reading of the holy Gospel, stood forward from his place in the presbytery, and began to explain either the Gospel text itself or some passage in the Old Testament which also had formed part of the liturgical service, it was well understood that he was speaking with authority. And this is the first light in which we should view his Homilies.

It would be saying little to say that Origen's Homilies and Commentaries (for we need not distinguish them here) marked an era in the exposition of Scripture. They not only were the first of their kind, but they may be said to have created the art, and not only to have created it, but, in certain aspects, to have finished it and to have become, like Aristotle, in some of his treatises, at once the model and the quarry for future generations. It may be true, as of course it is, that he was not absolutely the first to write expositions of Scripture. The splendid eloquence of Theophilus of Antioch had already been heard on the four Gospels, and his spirit of interpretation seems to have had much more affinity for Origen's own spirit than for that of the school of his own Antioch two centuries later. Melito had written on the Apocalypse, but his direct labours on Scripture were only an insignificant part of his voluminous works, if, indeed, they were not all rather apologetic and hortatory than explanatory. The Mosaic account of the creation had occupied a few fathers with its defence against Gnostic and infidel. But we know from Origen's own words that he had read and used "his predecessors," as he calls them. And yet we may truly say that he is the first of commentators, not only because no one before him had dared to undertake the whole Scripture, but on account of his novel and regular method. He is termed by one great authority, Sixtus Senensis, "almost self-taught," so little of what he says can he have gleaned from others. But in estimating how much Origen owed to those before him, we should lose a valuable hint towards understanding him if we forgot Clement of Alexandria and the great body of tradition, oral and written, of which the Alexandrian school was the head-quarters. We know that the Alexandrian Jew, Philo, two hundred years before Clement's time, had written wonderful lucubrations on the mystical sense of holy Scripture. The Alexandrian catechetical teachers, catching and using the spirit of the place, had always been Alexandrian in their Scriptural teachings. Clement himself had commented on the whole of the Scriptures in his book called the *Hypotyposes*. Origen entered into this inheritance. We see the spirit of the time and place in those questionings with which, in his early years, he used to puzzle his father. The unrivalled industry that made him collect versions of the

sacred text from Syria, Asia, and even the shores of Greece, must have scrupulously sought out and exhausted every source of information and every extant document relating to Scripture exposition that was at hand for him in his own city. So that Origen, though in one sense the founder of a school, was really the culmination of a series of learned men, and, by the influence of his name, made common to the Universal Church that knowledge and method which before had been confined to the pupils that had listened to the Catechisms.

Although, however, we may guess, we cannot be certain how progressively or gradually a methodical and scientific exegesis had been growing up at Alexandria; and we come upon the Commentaries of Origen with all the freshness of a discovery. Before him we have been accustomed to writings like those of the Apostolic Fathers; we have been reading apologies of the most wonderful eloquence, whose Greek shames the rhetoricians, or whose Latin has all the spirit, earnestness, and tenderness of new language, but in which Holy Scripture is at the most only summarised and held up to view. Or, again, we have been listening to a venerable priest crushing the heretics with the word of God, or to a philosopher confuting the Jews out of their own mouth. Or, once more, we have heard the pagan intellect of the world convinced that truth was nowhere to be found but in Jesus, that the writings of the prophets were better than those of the philosophers, and that the morality of the New Testament cast far into the shade the sayings of Socrates. Splendid ideas, striking applications, telling proofs, grand views, all these the early fathers found in holy Scripture, and all these they used in the exhortations, apologies, or refutations that were called for by the several necessities of their times. But sustained, regular commentary, as such, they have none, or, what is the same to us now, none has come down. The explanation of words, the classification of meanings, the distinction of senses, the answering of difficulties and the solution of objections,—all this, done, not for an odd portion of the text here and there, but regularly through the whole Bible, is what distinguishes the labours of Origen from those of all who have gone before him, and makes them so important for all who shall come after him. In making acquaintance with him we feel that we have come across a master, with breadth of view enough to handle masses of materials in a scientific way, and with learning enough never to be in want of materials for his science. We see in his Scripture Commentaries the pressure of three forces of unequal strength, but each of them of marked presence, the tradition of the Church, the teachings

of the great school, and the needs of his own times. To understand him we must understand this pressure under which he wrote. The first two forces may be passed over as requiring no explanation. We must dwell a little on the latter, for unless we vividly realize the necessities under which the Christian teacher in his time lay, of meeting certain enemies and withstanding certain views, we shall be led to join in the cry of those who exclaim against Origen's Scripture exposition as partly useless and partly dangerous.

These necessities arose from two phenomena that appeared almost with the birth of Christianity, and which, with a somewhat wide generalization, we may call the Ebionite and the Gnostic. No one can have looked into early church history without being struck by the difficulty the Church seems to have had to free herself from the trammels of Judaism. We need not allude to S. Paul, and his Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans, and his various contentions with friend and foe for the freedom of the Gospel. The Epistle to the Hebrews, with its thoroughness of dogmatic exposition and its grand style, was also addressed to the Judaizants. Nay, if Ebion himself ever had an existence, it is more than probable that he was teaching at Jerusalem about the very time at which the Epistle seems to have been written and sent, if sent, to the Christian Jews of that city. It is certain, however, that Alexandria was one of the very earliest of the churches which shook itself free, in a marked manner, from the traditions of the law. The cosmopolitan spirit of the great city was a powerful natural auxiliary in a development which was substantially brought about by the Holy Ghost and the pastors of the patriarchal see. The Hebrew element hardly ever had such a footing at Alexandria as it had at Antioch. We can see in the writings of Justin Martyr (*circa* 160), whose wide experience of all the Churches makes his testimony especially valuable, a picture of Christianity, young and exuberant, with its face joyously set to its destined career, and with the swathing-bands of the synagogue lying neglected behind it. Justin had an Alexandrian training, and among his many-sided gifts shone pre-eminent that intellectual culture which was the most effectual of the human weapons that beat off the spirit of Judaism. And in Clement himself there is no trace of any narrow formalism, but, on the contrary, a grand, world-embracing charity, that can recognize the work of the Divine Logos in all the manifold varieties of human wisdom and human beauty. So that long before the time that Origen succeeded his master, the Alexandrian Church was free from all suspicion of clinging to what S. Paul calls



the "yoke of bondage;" and knew no distinction of Jew or Greek. But the party that had troubled the Apostle, and spread itself through the churches almost as soon as the churches were founded, was by no means extinct, even at Alexandria. Since the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews had become scattered all over the empire. The great towns, such as Antioch, Cæsarea, and Alexandria, each contained a strong Jewish community. At Alexandria they were numerous enough to have a quarter to themselves. Now, it is not too much to say that many so-called Jews and Christians in such a city were neither Jews nor Christians, but Ebionites; that is, they acknowledged the divine mission of Christ, which destroyed their genuine Judaism, but denied His divinity, which was still more fatal to their Christianity. The consequences of such a state of things to the interpretation of Scripture are manifest. The law was still good and binding. Jerusalem was still the holy city, the chosen of God, and the spiritual and temporal capital of the world. S. Paul was denounced as one who admitted heathen innovations and destroyed the word of God. Everything in holy Scripture, that is, in the Old Testament and in the scanty excerpts from the New, which they admitted, was to be understood in a rigorously literal sense; and the "Clementines," once falsely attributed to S. Clement of Rome, but now considered to belong to the second century, and to be the work of an Ebionite, are the only writings of the period in which the allegorical sense is totally and peremptorily denied. Ebionism was not very consistent with itself, and the Ebionites of S. Jerome's time would hardly have saluted their sterner brethren of the Apostolic age; but the name may always be truly taken to typify those whose views led them to hold to the "carnal letter" of the Old Testament. They carried the old Jewish exclusiveness into Christianity. They considered the historical parts of the Scripture to have been written merely because their own history was so important in God's sight that He thought it right to preserve its minutest record. The prophecies were only meant to glorify, to warn, or to terrify themselves, and had no message for the Gentiles. Even the parables and figures that occurred in the imagery of the inspired writer were dragged down to the most absurd and literal significations. The adherents of Ebionism were neither few nor silent in the time of Origen.

But if the Ebionite party in Alexandria, and in the Church generally, was strong and stirring, there was a party not less important, perhaps, who, in their zeal for the freedom of Christianity against the bonds of Judaism, were in danger of

going quite as far wrong in a different direction. It is always the case in a reaction, that the returning force finds it difficult to stop at its due mark. So it had been with the re-action against the Ebionites, and especially at Alexandria. There was a body of advanced Christians who did not content themselves with not observing the law, but went on to depreciate it. It was not enough for them to see the Old Testament fulfilled by Jesus Christ, but they must need show that it never had much claim to be even a preparation and a type. It was full of frivolous details, useless records, and absurd narrations. Who cared for the *minutiae* about Pharaoh's butler, Joseph's coat, or Tobias's dog? Of what importance to the world were the marchings and counter-marchings, the stupid obstinacy and the unsavoury morality of a few thousand Hebrews? Who was interested to hear how their prophets scolded them, or their enemies destroyed them, or their kings tyrannized over them? How could it edify Christians to know the number and colour of the skins of the tabernacle, or the names of the masons and blacksmiths that built the Temple, or the fact that the Jewish people considerably varied their carnal piety by intervals of still more carnal crime and idolatry? The state of things represented by the Old Testament had passed away, and they were of no interest save as ancient history; and, therefore, it was absurd to treasure up the Pentateuch and the Prophets as if they were anything more, and not rather much less, than the rhapsodies of Homer and the travels of Herodotus. In fact—and to this conclusion a considerable party came before long—the Old Testament was certainly not divine at all; at any rate, it was not the work of the Father of the Lord Jesus, but of some other principle. And here the Gnostic interest was at hand with an opportune idea. Who *could* have written the Old Testament but the Demiurge? That primary offshoot of the Divinity, just, but not good (this was their distinction), can never have been more worthily employed than in concocting a series of writings in which there was some skill, some justice, and very little goodness. The Demiurge was certainly a handy suggestion, and the consigning of the Old Testament to his workmanship made all commentary thereon compressible into a very brief space. Away with it all, for a farrago of nonsense, lies, and nuisances!

Of course, neither of these parties, when extremely developed, could lay any claim to Christianity. But the world of that day had in it Ebionites and Gnostics of every degree and every changing hue of error. They were not unrepresented in the very bosom of the Church. Pious Christians might be found who, strong in filial feeling to their Jewish

great-grandfathers, would see in the records of the Old Covenant nothing but a most interesting family history, with delightfully long pedigrees and a great deal of strong language about the glory and dignity of the descendants of Israel. On the other hand, equally pious Christians, and among them a great majority, perhaps, of the Gentile converts, would consider it an extravagant compliment to read in the house of God the sayings and doings of such a very unworthy set of people as the Hebrews. And the remarkable fact would be, that both these sets of worthy Christians would begin with the same fundamental error, though arriving at precisely opposite conclusions. That the Old Testament had a literal meaning, *and no other*, was the starting-point of both Ebionite and Gnostic. The former concluded, "therefore let us honour it, for we are a divine race;" the latter, "therefore let us reject it, for what are the Jews to us?"

It would not require many sentences to prove, if our object in these notes were proof of any sort, that Origen's leading idea in his Scripture-exposition is to look for the mystical sense. His very name is a synonyme for allegory, and he is, perhaps, as often blamed for it as praised. But even blame, when outspoken and honest, is better than feeble excuse; and unfortunately not a few of the great Alexandrian's critics have undertaken to excuse him for having such a leaning to allegory. The Neo-Platonists, they say, dealt largely in myths, and allegorised everything; somebody allegorised Homer just about that time. Now Origen was a Platonist. We might answer, that Origen was above all a Christian, and knew very little of Plato till he was thirty years old; and that the Greek allegories were invented by a more decorous generation for the purpose of veiling the grossness of the popular mythology; whereas the Christian allegory, as introduced by S. Paul, or indeed by our Blessed Saviour, was a spiritual and mysterious application of real facts. Others, again, offer the excuse that Philo had allegorised very much, and Origen admired Philo. This is saying that allegory was very usual at Alexandria, as we have said ourselves when speaking of S. Clement. But it is not saying why allegory was kept up so warmly in the school of the Catechisms, or what was the radical cause that made its being kept up there a necessity for the well-being of the Church. This we have endeavoured to state in the foregoing remarks.

When Origen, then, announces his grand principle of Scripture-commentary, in the fourth book of the *De Principiis*, we may be excused if we see in it the statement of an im-

portant canon, whereby to understand much that he has written. He says, "Wherefore, to those who are convinced that the sacred books are not the utterances of man, but were written and made over to us by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, by the will of God the Father of all, through Jesus Christ, we will endeavour to point out how they are to read them, keeping the rules of the divine and apostolic Church of Jesus Christ." This is the key-note of all his exposition, and derives its significance from the state of opinions among those for whom he wrote; and a dispassionate application of it to such passages as seem questionable or gratuitous in his writings, will explain many a difficulty, and show how clearly he apprehended the work he had to do. If the Old Testament be really the word of the Holy Ghost, as, he says, all true Christians believe, then nothing in it can be trivial, nothing useless, nothing false. This he insists upon over and over again. And, descending more to particulars, he states these three celebrated rules of interpretation, which may be called, with their development, his contribution to Scripture-exposition. They are so plainly aimed at Ebionites and Gnostics, that we need merely state them to show the connection.

His first rule regards the old Law. The Law, he says, being abrogated by Jesus Christ, the precepts and ordinances that are purely legal are no longer to be taken and acted up to literally, but only in their mystical sense. This seems rudimentary and evident now-a-days; but at that period it greatly needed to be clearly stated and enforced.

His second rule is about the history and prophecy relating to Jew or Gentile that is found in the Old Testament. The Ebionite who kissed the Pentateuch, and the Gnostic who tore it up, were both foolish, because both ignorant. These historic and prophetic details were undoubtedly true in their letter; but their chief use to the Christian Church, and the main object the Holy Spirit had in giving them to us, was the mystical meaning that lies hidden under the letter. Thus the earthly Pharaoh, the earthly Jerusalem, Babylon, or Egypt, are chiefly of importance to the Church from the fact that they are the allegories of heavenly truths.

Origen's third canon of Scriptural exposition is this:—"Whatever in holy Scripture seems trivial, useless, or false" (the Gnostics could not or would not see that parabolic narratives are most unjustly called false), "is by no means to be rejected, but its presence in the divine record is to be explained by the fact that the divine Author had a deeper and more important meaning in it than appears from the letter. Such portions, therefore, must be taken and applied in a

spiritual and mystical sense, in which sense chiefly they were dictated by Almighty God."

These three rules look simple now; they were all-important and not so simple then. It was by means of them, and in the spirit which they indicate, that the great catechist led his hearers by the hand through the flowery paths of God's word, and in his own, easy, simple, earnest style, so different from that of the rhetoricians, showed them the true use of the Old Testament. We hope it is not a fanciful idea, but it has struck us that, the difference of circumstances considered, there are few writers so like each other in their handling of holy Scripture as Origen and S. John of the Cross. Both treat of deep truths, and in a phraseology that sounds uncommon,—the one because his hearers were intellectual Greeks, the other because he is professedly treating of the very highest points of the spiritual life. Both use holy Scripture in a fashion that is absolutely startling to those who are accustomed to rationalistic Protestantism, or to what may be called the domestic wife-and-children interpretation of the Evangelicals. Both bring forward, in the most unhesitating manner, the mystic sense of the inspired words to prove or illustrate their point, and both mix up with their more abstruse disquisitions a large amount of practical matter in the very plainest words. From communion with both of them we rise full of a new sense of the presence and nearness of the Spirit of God, and of reverence for the minutest details of His Word. Finally, both the Greek father and the Spanish mystic interpret the ceremonial prescriptions, the history, the allusions to physical nature, and the incidents of domestic life that occur in the Old Testament, as if all these, however important in their letter, had a far deeper and more interesting signification addressed to the spiritual sense of the spiritual Christian.

To illustrate Origen's principles of Scripture interpretation by extracts from his works would exceed our present limits, however interesting and satisfactory the task might be. Neither have we space to notice his celebrated division of the meaning of the text into literal, mystical, and moral, a division he was the first to insist upon formally. To answer the objections of critics against both his principles and his alleged practice would also be a distinct task of great length. We must content ourselves with having briefly sketched and indicated his spirit. There are grave theological controversies too, as is well known, connected with his name; and on these we have had no thought of entering. The purpose of this and the preceding article has not been dogmatical, but rather biographical. We have attempted to set forth on the one hand the personal

character of this great man ; on the other, the external circumstances by which that character was influenced, and through which it exercised influence on others.

#### ART. V.—DR. PUSEY'S PROJECT OF UNION.

*The Reunion of Christendom.* A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. London : Longman.

*An Eirenicon.* By E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Oxford : Parker.

*The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work,* Reviewed in a Letter addressed (by permission) to the Most Rev. H. E. Manning, D.D. By the Very Rev. FREDERICK OAKELEY, M.A. London : Longmans.

*Letter to the Weekly Register of Nov. 25, 1865,* signed E. B. PUSEY.

OUR former article on Dr. Pusey was in type (as we there explained) before his various letters had appeared ; and it conveyed therefore exclusively the impression made on our mind by the volume itself. That impression was very unfavourable. We never of course doubted, that the book had been intended as an *Eirenicon* ; but we certainly thought that a far more prominent purpose in its author's mind, was to exhibit pointedly the "doctrinal corruptions" involved in Roman Catholic practice, and to warn individuals against joining her communion. Even F. Newman, who writes to him in the most friendly spirit, tells him that he has "discharged his olive branch as if from a catapult" (p. 9).

We frankly avow, however, that Dr. Pusey's subsequent letters, and indeed his whole subsequent course, have convinced us we were mistaken. We see now clearly that the aim at Christian unity, by means too of union with the Holy See,—had a far stronger hold on his mind than we at all suspected. Nor should we do justice to our own feelings, if we did not express our testimony to the consistent and touching gentleness of his demeanour, in regard to the various comments which his volume has elicited. That God may complete the good work which He has begun in him, is among our sincerest and most fervent prayers.

Three important publications on Dr. Pusey have already appeared on the Catholic side. Of these, F. Newman's and F. Gallwey's shall be separately noticed ; as their pamphlets do



not bear on that question of corporate union, which is our present theme. Canon Oakeley has produced what to our mind is about the best thing (in prose) which he has ever done; and this is saying a great deal. His pamphlet is a model of the true controversial spirit; gentle and kindly, yet uncompromising: while his argument is throughout effective, and on one or two critical points triumphant. We shall be glad to relieve the heaviness of our matter, by several quotations from so graceful and flowing a pen.

It has happened at this eventful controversial period, that it became the Archbishop's duty to promulgate Cardinal Patrizi's new response on the Union question. This has naturally issued in his addressing a Pastoral Letter to his clergy, on the general subject of Christian reunion. A bishop's pastoral address cannot, we imagine, under any circumstances, be a legitimate object of public criticism; but in the present instance adverse criticism would be impossible. The Archbishop has uttered, in his characteristically impressive, distinct, and weighty manner, certain great doctrines, which are at the root of every Catholic's belief; but which Unionists in general—Catholic, alas! no less than Protestant—in some strange way manage to ignore and pass over. This address is in fact an authoritative exposition of principles, absolutely certain, inappreciably momentous, yet constantly put out of sight. It will be our own guide throughout. We shall but aim at illustrating, in this article by theological argument, and in our final article by ecclesiastical history, those foundations of Catholic Truth, which have been authoritatively laid down for us by the most exalted member of our English hierarchy.

Nor can we more appropriately commence, than by his Grace's language on the unspeakable importance of religious unity; a truth which he, and those who most closely follow his guidance, have been most strangely suspected of undervaluing.\*

For my own part, if I may speak of myself, it is more than a quarter of a century since the thought and name of unity so filled my whole mind, that it has been often turned to my reproach. In all these years it has been my heart's desire and prayer, not only to see the members of the Anglican body gathered into Catholic unity, but the millions of Dissenters, that is, the whole English people, especially the multitude of its noble-hearted poor, united

---

\* Here is a fact, incredible *à priori*, but true. The *Union Review* of last September (p. 499), asserts that that union of Christians, for which Our Lord prayed, "is the subject of the DUBLIN'S most bitter and continuous execration."

once more in the bond of peace and truth. We believe union to be a very precious gift, *and only less precious than truth*. There is nothing we would not do or suffer, by the grace of God, to effect or to promote the reunion of all, or of any who are out of the fold, to the unity of the Church. We heartily pray, therefore, that He who has inspired and nurtured this desire of union may mature and perfect it; that He will remove all that hinders its accomplishment, purifying the hearts of men from all attachment to their errors and their separations, and cleansing their intelligence to see the immutable faith and sole unity of the Catholic and Roman Church. On our part, all that can cherish and foster these yearnings shall be done. The vision of England Catholic once more; its true and energetic people once more elevated by faith to the higher instincts of the Catholic Church; our domestic schisms healed, our bitter controversies ended, and all our powers turned from mutual conflict, upon the subjugation of the sin and unbelief which, day and night, devour souls on every side: all this is as beautiful and fascinating as the image of the Heavenly Jerusalem which the Apostle saw coming down from heaven. There is only one thing more beautiful and more commanding, and that is the Heavenly Jerusalem itself, not in image, but in reality; the Holy Church throughout the world in all the perfect symmetry of unity and truth, indefectible and infallible, incorruptible and changeless, the mother of us all, the kingdom of God on earth (pp. 15, 16).

These expressions will find an echo in every Catholic heart. That there is to be a life-long conflict between the principles of good and evil—this is an inevitable dispensation; but that those who love their God and their Saviour, should dissipate their energies in contending against each other, rather than combine them in contending against the world,—this is a matter for keenest grief. And in these days particularly, when the whole mass of European society is animated by principles profoundly anti-Catholic, “the reunion of Christendom” is the only adequate remedy (if indeed it be adequate) to cope with so fatal a disease.

But on what basis shall we labour to establish this reunion? on a latitudinarian or a dogmatic? The popular specific at this day is of course the former. “Let all religionists continue to think as they do in other respects; but let them cease to think that these points of difference are important.” Such at one time was Constantine’s view, as it has been of many another secular potentate.\* “Why should Catholics and Arians,” he asked in effect, “disturb the world by their contentions? Why should they not agree to differ? Why should not those who adore our Lord as the Creator, and those who reverence him as the highest of creatures, remain contentedly united in the same Church?” One or two writers in the

---

\* See the passage in F. Newman’s “Anglican Difficulties,” p. 312.

*Union Review* are undoubtedly imbued with this poison of in-differentism; but Dr. Pusey will regard it with as much loathing as we do. In our present discussion we will speak of it no further.

Reunion then is to be sought on a dogmatic basis. Is it however, we ask, to include Roman Catholics or to exclude them? Of course, the former. But then this significant fact at once presents itself, that these cannot possibly accept any other dogmatic basis than their own. They consider that that basis was revealed directly by God; and that it has been preserved in absolute purity, by that gift of infallibility with which He has endowed the Church. Moreover, this dogmatic basis includes prominently, nay primarily, the doctrine, that the Roman Catholic Church is the one ark of salvation; that no one external to her can possibly be saved, unless he have the plea of invincible ignorance; that her teaching is, by Divine promise, infallibly true. As the Archbishop points out, this is no ultramontane characteristic; it is the doctrine of Bossuet no less strongly than that of Bellarmine (pp. 30, 31). Indeed, no words can be imagined more emphatic and unmistakable, than those testimonies of the latter writer, which the Archbishop textually quotes. Of course, Roman Catholics may seek union on some other dogmatic basis than this, by the simple and intelligible method of apostatising from their religion; but no Christian can possibly be united with Roman Catholics who *remain* such, except by submitting humbly and unreservedly to the Roman Catholic Church. The fundamental, the inappreciable significance of this fact, induced us to make it the one main theme of our former article on Dr. Pusey: it was our one main purpose throughout that article, to argue against him, on grounds of Scripture and Antiquity, that the Church in communion with Rome constitutes exclusively that one heavenly society, "*extra quam nulla est salus.*"

Now if we may judge from appearances, we should say that those Anglicans who at this moment are speaking so much of Union, are divisible into two different classes. In the case of many, we really believe that Unionism is a healthy and hopeful stage, in their journey from the bad extreme of contented isolation to the good extreme of humble submission.\* With others, however, the project of Union seems a pretext, for

---

\* So Canon Oakeley:—"There was not one of us earlier converts (unless indeed, it were our far-sighted friend John Henry Newman), who was not, to use a familiar phrase, 'bitten' with the theory of a 'corporate reunion,' or, at least, who did not foster the hope of something like a combined movement, before he decided upon taking an independent step."—(Pp. 46-47.)

ignoring the consequences legitimately deducible from their Church's frightful corruptions; and for shutting their eyes to the peremptory obligation, of fleeing for safety to the ark of God. But to whichever of these classes an individual may belong, nothing but good, we are convinced, can result, from pressing on his attention that fundamental dogma of Rome on which we have been insisting. We are very far from meaning to deny, that in many cases a considerable period will elapse, before inquirers attain to that solid conviction, which may be a sufficient ground for seeking admission into the Church. But if they from the first understand, that there is no middle position; that there is no possibility of union with Rome, except by recognising her as their one infallible guide to heaven;—they will obtain a most precious security, against that spirit of self-will, of private judgment, of proud and fastidious criticism, which is so largely fostered by idle and foolish talk about "negotiations" and "terms of union." They will examine far more jealously the grounds of their objection to Roman teaching, and will be far more eager in their endeavour to understand the true nature of that teaching. They will dwell, far more earnestly than now they do, on the well-known fact, that in every period he who first submits to the Church as an adult, must at starting accept many things on faith. They will be far keener and more unreserved in their prayers for light and guidance, and for the all-important grace of humility.

So far as Dr. Pusey is personally concerned, all who read his *Eirenicon* with any care must see, that when he wrote it he had not in the slightest degree realized—we doubt if he had speculatively apprehended—the exclusive claims, so peremptorily made for herself by the Church of Rome. In proportion as he does so, he will see that his whole practical proposal is simply unmeaning. He has one extremely definite question to consider, and only one. Is the Roman Communion exclusively the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church? Is his own communion schismatical? Is he at this moment as truly external to the Visible Church, as any Methodist or Quaker in the land? *Until* he answers these questions in the affirmative, he cannot be received (if he wishes it) into the Roman Catholic Church. *So soon as* he answers them in the affirmative, he would be formally committing mortal sin and meriting hell, if he delayed for one moment (as we are most certain he would *not* delay) in resolving to make his unreserved submission.

If it were our sole desire to silence Dr. Pusey by a *reductio ad absurdum*, it could not be necessary to add another word. But God knows that this is neither all nor any part of our desire:

we wish simply to do whatever may lie in our power, in order that his noble aspirations after unity may obtain their legitimate fulfilment. This, however, is certain, that he must move towards the Catholic Church, not she towards him; and that our only method, therefore, for hastening his approach to Christian unity, is to assist in removing from his mind those numerous misapprehensions which so curiously hamper his every movement. This has already been in part done, and is still being done, by several Catholics. In our promised discussions on Marian devotion and Papal supremacy, we hope we may contribute our own humble efforts to that end; and our present paper will be addressed in the same direction. His speculations on corporate Union, and on the means by which it may be healthily accomplished, are vitiated throughout (as we consider) by three pervasive misconceptions; and to clear up these, is the purpose of our article.

Firstly, we cannot see how on his principles any permanent union is attainable at all. God himself has laid down the only true basis on which such a result can be achieved, by imposing the precept of submission to one central authority. But Dr. Pusey does not yet believe the existence of that precept; and he is precluded, therefore, from suggesting any other means of unity, except the voluntary federation of independent "branches." But it is plain that if these "branches" are free to come together, they are equally free to separate again. Let us suppose (per impossibile) an union effected on Dr. Pusey's terms. Well, in what age of the Church has there not been an abundance of religious differences and misunderstandings? And as soon as any one such arises, what motive can Dr. Pusey supply, for retaining the hostile parties in union with each other? The laboriously-created fabric of artificial unity would crumble at a breath, and be dissolved into its original elements. Unity can be found only in subjection to Rome; hearty and profound unity, only in hearty and profound subjection.

Dr. Pusey's second misconception requires a very far longer and more careful consideration; and leads us, indeed, to a discussion of the gravest practical moment. If there be one assumption more than another, which penetrates every corner of the Eirenicon,—which absolutely challenges a Catholic's criticism,—it is his uniform denial of the Church's infallibility in her magisterium. Of all his principles, there is none, to our mind, more profoundly anti-Catholic, than the distinction which he draws throughout between the Church's formal and her practical teaching. Not only he does not consider the Roman Catholic Church as infallible in this latter respect; he evidently

has not the faintest suspicion, that she even claims such infallibility. To abstain from commenting on this error, is to abstain from commenting on what is literally the chief feature of his book; and yet a full exposition of the contrary doctrine would require a volume. We must do it, however, the best justice, which our limits render possible.

Before entering on this discussion, we will briefly express our unfeigned amazement at Dr. Pusey's implied opinion, that he can, at least, accept Rome's formal decrees. In one or two recent letters, indeed, he seems more or less to have retracted that opinion; but it will be well, at all events, to show, by a few instances out of many which might be given, how greatly the fact is otherwise. We will begin with the Council of Trent, because Dr. Pusey has particularly referred to it. "I have long been convinced," he writes to the *Weekly Register*, "that there is nothing in the Council of Trent, which could not be explained satisfactorily to us." Yet he comments in the *Eirenicon* (p. 94) on "the marriage-law of the Council of Trent, which *allows* what the whole Church, from the first until . . . Alexander VI. . . , held to be *incest*." And certainly it is difficult to see, how he is otherwise than in direct conflict with the Council on this matter. He repeatedly refers in the *Eirenicon* to his evidence before the Parliamentary Commission, as expressing his present convictions; and this evidence proceeds throughout (as we understand it) on the basis, that the Church has no power of dispensation, as regards those grades of consanguinity and affinity which are mentioned in Leviticus. But this proposition was expressly anathematized at Trent: "If any one shall have said, that those grades only of consanguinity and affinity, which are expressed in Leviticus, can impede (impedire) a marriage from being contracted, and nullify (dirimere) it when contracted; and that the Church cannot dispense in some of them, or [again cannot] appoint that a larger number of grades impede and nullify; let him be anathema" (Session 24, Canon 3).

Another definition of Trent bears on a matter, far more universally and urgently practical. If there is one question more momentous than another to the mass of baptized Christians, it is on the means of obtaining remission for mortal sin. On this the Council speaks expressly: "If any one shall have denied that sacramental confession was instituted, and is necessary to salvation, by the law of God . . . let him be anathema" (Session 14, Canon 6). And the sense of this canon is authoritatively laid down, in the previous instruction of the Council (cap. 5): "The Church hath ever understood that complete (integram) confession of sins is necessary by



God's law to all who have fallen after baptism." Does Dr. Pusey, or does he not, believe that God has commanded sacramental confession, as obligatory on all those who have fallen after baptism? If he does *not* believe it, he incurs the anathema of Trent. But if he does believe it, how can he consider his own communion to be a "branch" of the Church? Christ, it seems, gave the precept, and entrusted the Church with its promulgation. To say that the Church of England has totally omitted to promulgate it;—that the great body of Anglicans have remained in total ignorance of it;—that the vast majority of them have inveighed against all belief in its existence, as being among the worst errors of "Popery;"—all this is to say little. The Prayer-Book itself, by the most manifest implication, actually denies it. "If there be any of you," the unhappy clergyman is obliged to say, "who by this means [self-examination, confession to God, reparation to man] cannot quiet his own conscience therein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other... minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding all scruple and doubtfulness." Confession to a "minister," you see, is represented, not as required by the Divine law, nay, nor even as in itself desirable: but simply as the lesser of two evils; as a useful soporific, to those who cannot otherwise "quiet their own conscience."

Canon Oakeley has reprinted (pp. 63-73) a very valuable letter from Canon Estcourt to the *Weekly Register*, enforcing the manifold contradictions which exist, between the Anglican formularies and the Council of Trent. There is but one sentence in this letter, to which we would take exception; viz., the writer's statement (p. 64) that "the articles are not . . . supposed to bind the conscience of those who subscribe them." We think that most converts will remember themselves to have thought otherwise; and (unless our memory deceives us), in the required formula subscription was given "ex animo."

But the Tridentine decrees are not the Church's only definitions; though Dr. Pusey often speaks as if they were. That God has revealed Mary's Immaculate Conception, is held by every Catholic as no less certain, than that He has revealed the Trinity and Incarnation. According to Dr. Pusey, God has revealed the direct contradictory (see *e. g.* p. 181); viz., that every human person, born since the Fall, has been once under the dominion of original sin. And Dr. Pusey, in conse-

quence, regards the definition of 1854 as "an insoluble difference between the modern Roman and the ancient Church" (p. 121). We have observed, however, with great pleasure, that in a recent letter to the *Guardian* he expresses himself with far less aversion to this dogma, than he formerly did; and as he is still under some misconception as to its real meaning, there is hope that further explanation may remove still further difficulty.

Then there is the Decree of Florence, on which we are to speak in another article. No one ever has attempted, or by possibility ever can attempt, to give this Decree any sense consistent with the supposition, that either the Greek or the Anglican communion is included in the visible Church. Canon Oakeley points this out (p. 5); and says that the fact escaped his own notice and that of his friends, when they professed, as Anglicans, to hold "all Roman doctrine."

There is no necessity for further multiplying these instances of contrariety. We will conclude, therefore, for special reasons, with citing this proposition. "In these last ages, a general obscurity has been spread over truths of graver moment, appertaining to religion, and which are the bases of faith and of the moral doctrine of Jesus Christ." This proposition was expressed, by certain professing Catholics, as applicable to the Roman Catholic Church "in these last ages;" nor does it seem possible to deny, that both Dr. Pusey and all Anglican Unionists regard it as truly so applicable. As to Dr. Pusey himself, the extracts we shall presently give from his *Eirenicon*, will show abundantly that such is his opinion. Is there any "truth appertaining to religion" which can more truly be called "of graver moment," than our Lord's Atonement and Intercession? Yet it is one main end—judging from the volume itself, we should have said it is the one main end—of his *Eirenicon*, to establish that this truth, during the last centuries, has been miserably obscured within the Roman Catholic Church, through the growth and wide prevalence of Marian devotion. Now, what has Rome formally decreed, on the proposition above recited? She has denounced it as "heretical" (Bull, "*Auctorem Fidei*," of Pius VI.); and the whole Episcopate has accepted the sentence. The grounds of that sentence are evident to every Roman Catholic. Such a proposition, whether coming from the Synod of Pistoia or from Dr. Pusey, directly denies the Church's prerogative, as being the faithful guardian of divine truth in every age. It denies, we say, her prerogative of infallibly preserving the Truth, in all its fulness and in all its purity.

This consideration, then, leads us naturally to the second proposed subject of our article : the Church's infallibility in her magisterium, and Dr. Pusey's denial of that infallibility. On this most important subject, we will first lay down those general principles which we consider true, and afterwards apply those principles to the particular case of Dr. Pusey. On the question of principles, we would earnestly entreat our readers' attention to the following powerful and most important remarks, which occur in Canon Oakeley's pamphlet :—

God the Holy Ghost is the Creator of the Church, and it is in Him that the Church lives and moves and has its being. When He vouchsafed to form it on the Day of Pentecost, He not only descended on the heads of the Apostles, but filled the whole room in which they were gathered together with Mary their Queen, and others of our Lord's disciples. He guided them, as the Lord had promised, "into all truth." All that man is required to believe unto salvation—all that ever has been, or that ever will be, drawn out into the shape of explicit dogma, was virtually and implicitly contained in that one original revelation ; but together with it there was infused into the Church the principle of life, and a power, analogous to that annexed in the creation of the material world to animal and vegetable nature,—the power of continuous reproduction in forms indefinitely various in their details, but all of them founded essentially upon the original type. Hence the Church, when viewed at any period of her subsequent history, presents the appearance, not of a sterile form or stereotyped literature, but of a *world teeming with spiritual animation*. Here is the theologian working out the problems of his science from its elementary axioms ; there is the saint following out a train of thought on the Incarnation, and resting with holy rapture on inferences strictly within the terms of the faith, yet hidden from minds less purified from earthly stain, or less practised in the exercise of mental prayer ; while, in addition to the fruits which are continually added to the Church's store of untechnical and traditionary knowledge, she is always gathering in fresh resources of the same kind from the attestation of miracles, the illustrations of saintly example, the growth and influence of popular devotions, the comparison of experiences, the collision with error, and many other such outward manifestations of a pervading and vigorous life. It is thus that the Church weaves around her, as it were, a network of associations out of materials within herself, which is at once the evidence of her activity, and the protection of her weakness. *This is what men call her popular system ; the assemblage of secondary and influential doctrines constantly accruing from her energetic action, and gathering round her steps in multiplied profusion as she hastens down the course of ages.* . . .

Dr. Pusey and others, who look at us from without, always seem to argue as if what they call the popular system of the Roman Church were something which is of the "earth earthy"—a mass of corruption—the product of human infirmity or perversity, by which the pure gold of primitive Christianity is hidden or dimmed. What they desire is to see the Church relieved of this incubus, as they regard it ; to drive her within the entrenchments of

her ruled and abstract definitions. Thus Dr. Pusey would appeal from our theologians to the Church, as if the two witnesses were not consentient in their evidence. *The whole practical and devotional expression of the Church's mind he seems to look upon as a kind of traditionary gloss*, like that by which the Pharisees obscured the law of Moses. This is a view of the case against which we from within must strenuously protest as tantamount to a denial of a divine presence constantly within the Church, *by which she is secured from errancy, not only in her formal decisions, but in all which relates to the spiritual government of her members*, so far as it comes within the sphere of her responsibility (pp. 14, 15).

And now let us state, as accurately as we can, the doctrine here expressed and exemplified. Roman Catholics, throughout the world, are instructed in certain *doctrines*; are exhorted to certain *practices*; are encouraged and trained in certain *tempers and dispositions*. The Church's office in providing for this is called her "magisterium;" being that function whereby, as Perrone expresses it, "she leads them, as it were, by the hand, along the path of eternal salvation." "*Catholics contend*," he adds, "*all non-Catholics deny*, that Christ has endowed His Church with *infallibility* in this respect" (De Locis, n. 347-8). Now, firstly, when we say that this magisterium is *trustworthy*,—we mean (1) that the *doctrines* so taught are really truths revealed by God, or legitimate inferences therefrom; (2) that the *practices* thus inculcated are really serviceable for sanctification and salvation; and (3) that the *tempers and dispositions* so encouraged are really acceptable to Almighty God. And, secondly, when we further say that this magisterium is not *trustworthy* only, but *infallible*,—we mean that its trustworthiness is guaranteed by God's infallible promise.

Here, however, certain explanations are necessary. When we say that the Church's magisterium is infallible, we do not, of course, deny, that each several priest throughout Christendom falls probably into one mistake or another, on various minor matters connected with religion; for to deny this, would be almost to maintain that each several priest is infallible. Nor yet do we deny, that in one or other portion of the Church most serious doctrinal corruptions and heresies may arise; may infect priests and even bishops; and may give the supreme authority great trouble, before they are finally repressed: for to deny this would be to deny facts, which are on the surface of ecclesiastical history from first to last. But all this being fully admitted and allowed for, it still remains true that, in every part of the Roman Catholic Church, there is a large mass of such practical guidance as we have described, given to the people by their priests, with fullest knowledge

and approval of the Church's supreme authority. This constitutes what Dr. Pusey (p. 106) happily calls "the Church's practical teaching;" and what theologians ordinarily designate as her "juge magisterium." We must maintain, as an elementary Catholic doctrine, that she cannot "*recede*" from it, as Dr. Pusey wishes (*ibid.*), because she claims for it *infallibility*. Perrone speaks of this infallibility, we have seen, as "held by Catholics and denied by all others." He does not speak of it as of one Catholic view among many, but as of *the one* Catholic view; nor does he so much as hint, that among Catholics any other can possibly exist. Dr. Pusey himself, indeed, points out the universal prevalence among them of this conviction.

This argument (he says most truly) was used again and again by the bishops [before the definition of 1854]: "the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception must be true, because *the Church teaches it everywhere, and the Church cannot err*". . . We have been often told\* that it was enough for any one in the Roman communion to believe the Canons of the Council of Trent. The bishops of Spain and Portugal, especially, tell us of a vast practical system, *which the bishops and priests teach, and the people believe* as matter of faith.† And this system *being taught everywhere*,‡ . . . it, too, might be and must be assumed to be, of Divine tradition,§ and might be declared to be matter of saving faith.|| Some of the bishops observed that the doctrine of the Assumption . . . rested on the self-same authority. . . . There is the same practical teaching of the Assumption, as there was of the Immaculate Conception.—(Pp. 149, 150.)

How far such reasoning, before the definition of 1854, amounted to an actual proof of the Immaculate Conception, we shall presently consider. But as regards this general argument, drawn by the bishops from the Church's practical teaching, we must maintain, against Dr. Pusey, that nothing can be more cogent and logical, or more strictly conformable with sound ecclesiastical principle. Father Newman, in his "Apologia," has this very significant remark: "I disavowed and condemned [Protestant] excesses [when an Anglican]: *I wished to find a parallel disclaimer, on the part of Roman controversialists, of that popular system of beliefs and usages in their own Church which I called Popery*" (p. 197). In other

---

\* Most unjustifiably.—Ed. D. R.

† Rather "matter of certain and sure doctrine."—Ed. D. R.

‡ "With full knowledge and approval of Pope and bishops."—Ed. D. R.

§ "Or else a legitimate consequence therefrom."—Ed. D. R.

|| This does not necessarily follow.—Ed. D. R.

words, he wished to obtain an admission, that the Church is infallible indeed in her formal decrees, but not in her popular magisterium. "When that hope was [discovered by me to be] a dream, I saw that the controversy lay, between the book-theology of Anglicanism on the one side, and the *living system of what I called Roman corruption on the other.*" This was the practical conclusion of common sense.

Such, then, is the thesis which we are now to establish: "The Church is infallible in her magisterium, no less than in her formal decrees:" and we would urge the following on Dr. Pusey's attention, as an irrefragable proof of its truth. How does a Roman Catholic prove the Church's infallibility at all? Fundamentally and primarily, of course, by proving the infallibility of that Church, which the Apostles governed; and by then proceeding to prove, that the same privilege still remains. This was our reasoning in January, against Dr. Pusey's Apology for Anglicanism. In the Apostles' lifetime, we argued, the Church was one infallible society; their death caused no change in that particular; therefore she is one infallible society still. She inherits, then, not some other infallibility, but that precise infallibility which was first granted. Now, in what sense, in what respect, was the Apostles' Church infallible? Most undeniably, most obviously, in this precise respect of her *magisterium*. On the great Mysteries of Faith, there were no formal decrees at all during the Apostles' life; and many years of their government elapsed, before there was any Ecumenical Council whatever: yet no one will deny that the faith of Christians then rested on a secure basis. We drew out just now what we meant by the Church's infallibility in her magisterium: every syllable of that description applies, precisely and accurately, to the Apostolic period. Individual teachers were of course liable to error, because not one out of a thousand disciples received his full course of instruction from an inspired Apostle. In particular places, again, fearful corruptions of doctrine might arise; for did not the great body of Galatian converts fall from the Faith? But throughout the Church there was a large mass of practical guidance, both in doctrine and in spirituality, given by priests to the faithful, with full knowledge and approval of the Apostles. It was precisely the infallibility of this guidance, which was the infallibility of the then Church.

Such, then, is the proof which we allege for our thesis; and it is surely incontrovertible. That very course of argument which evinces that the Church is infallible at all, evinces directly, not that she is infallible in her *decrees*, but that she is infallible in her *magisterium*.



Or, to put the same thing in a somewhat different light. The Church of the Apostles, it will be admitted by Dr. Pusey, was recognized by all true Christians as their infallible guide to Heaven. But all Roman Catholics maintain, that the Roman Catholic Church of every age is lineal heir to that of the Apostles; they maintain, therefore, that she is her children's infallible guide to Heaven. Christians of the nineteenth century have the very same Rule of Faith with Christians of the first. Now, what can be more preposterous than to say that the Roman Catholic Church would be her children's infallible guide to Heaven—however free from error might be her formal decrees—if her *magisterium* were fallible; if the practical teaching, which she earnestly sanctions and diligently dispenses, could by possibility be false and anti-Christian? This is really the vital point at issue between Roman Catholics and Dr. Pusey. As an excellent writer in the *Tablet* urges (Feb. 10), "so long as he clings to the notion that the Church is a collection of formularies, however sacred and venerable, he is as far off in principle from the Church as the veriest Protestant. If he could lay hold of this very simple but fundamental idea, that the Church is his teacher, and not he the teacher of the Church, his difficulties would have vanished."

We have said that the Church is infallible in her *magisterium*, and not only in her formal decrees. But, indeed, a very little consideration will show something more than this; it will show that her infallibility in the former is the principal and predominating end, for which God has granted her infallibility in the latter. We argue as follows, in behalf of this further conclusion. For what purpose has God granted to the Church infallibility at all? Every Catholic will answer, "in order that true doctrine may be securely preserved, and false doctrine securely repelled." Now, from among the whole mass of Catholics, how many are there, who learn true doctrine immediately from the Church's infallible definitions? An almost infinitesimal proportion: none whatever of the uneducated classes; and of the educated, none except theological students. So, on the other hand, there are very numerous heretics who, from sheer intellectual incapacity, might altogether fail to see any contrariety between their own tenets and the Church's formal decrees. What, in fact, repels them from her communion, is the practical system of belief and worship, at which they feel an instinctive disgust. Both these great ends of infallibility, therefore, are immediately secured, by the infallibility, not of her decrees, but of her *magisterium*.

We are the very last indeed to be suspected of undervaluing

the inappreciable importance, whether of definitions,\* or of other doctrinal decisions; but we say that, as regards an ordinary Catholic, their importance consists, not in their direct, but their indirect influence. This indirect influence is immense. The whole sacerdotal body is trained, both to accept definitions with the certainty of divine faith, and also (in greater or less degree) to master their full import and bearing. Then, as regards other doctrinal decisions, every sound theologian considers these decisions (when issuing from the Ecclesia Docens) as no less infallible than definitions; and the large majority of priests so believe. But even this by no means exhausts the effect of these minor decisions. When the Pope, as Universal Teacher, declares some tenet theologically unsound, and when the Episcopate assent, all Catholics admit, in theory, that no public advocacy of such tenet is henceforward permissible. What follows from this? The contradictory truth is alone permitted to be taught, in text-books or by seminary professors; and the whole rising generation of priests imbibes it as certain and unquestioned. The powerful effect of all this, towards preserving in full purity the Church's practical teaching among Catholics in general, is too obvious to need another word.

We consider ourselves now to have established two conclusions: (1) that the Church is infallible in her magisterium, no less than in her decrees; and (2) that the latter infallibility is principally useful for the sake of the former. It will have further appeared from our argument, that the Church exercises a twofold magisterium: according as she respectively addresses—on one side, the few who can really master her formal decrees;—on the other side, the vast majority, whose chief means of apprehending Truth is very different. We may call the former her "theological," the latter her "popular" magisterium. Her theological magisterium consists primarily of course, but by no means exclusively, of her various definitions and doctrinal decisions; for which she demands that unreserved interior acceptance which is due to an infallible authority. Then further, as Pius IX. teaches in his Munich Brief:—

Even though the question concerned that subjection [of the intellect] which is to be yielded in an act of divine faith, yet that would have not to be confined to those things which have been hitherto defined by the express decrees of Œcumenical Councils or of Roman Pontiffs and this Apostolic See, but to be extended to *those things also which are delivered [to the faithful] as divinely*

---

\* For brevity's sake we will use this word throughout, as expressing definitions of faith.

revealed by the ordinary magisterium of the whole Church dispersed throughout the world, and are therefore accounted by Catholic theologians, with universal and consistent consent, to appertain to the faith. But since the question concerns that subjection by which all those Catholics are bound in conscience who apply themselves to the speculative sciences, in order that by their writings they may confer new benefits on the Church, therefore the men of the above-named Congress should recognize that it is not sufficient for learned [sapientibus] Catholics to receive and revere the before-mentioned dogmas of the Church; but that it is also necessary [opus esse] for them to subject themselves, as well to the doctrinal decisions which are issued by the Pontifical Congregations, as also to those heads of doctrine which are retained by the common and consistent consent of Catholics as theological truths, and as conclusions so certain that opinions adverse to the same, though they cannot be called heretical, yet deserve some other theological censure.

Or suppose some question to have been actively ventilated by theologians; and the whole body of them to have arrived confidently at the conclusion, that certain propositions relating to it are theologically unsound. Suppose also the Holy Father and the whole Ecclesia Docens to be well acquainted with this fact; and to display no kind of disapprobation, but rather the contrary. A moral certainty, we think, would thence arise, that the Church teaches magisterially, and therefore infallibly, the unsoundness of those propositions. There are various ascetical truths, again, on which the whole body of approved, ascetic writers are unanimous, as on truths absolutely fundamental and indubitable; and these (we think) may be considered as taught infallibly by the Ecclesia Docens. But there is no need of entering into detail and argument on this matter; because Dr. Pusey's objection refers exclusively, not to the Church's theological, but to her popular magisterium.

Our remaining remarks, therefore, will refer to the Church's popular magisterium. In regard to this magisterium, one point to be borne in mind throughout, is this; that the great mass of Catholics do not apprehend religious truth through formal statements, but incomparably rather through means more practically influential. It follows therefore, that if on any given subject we would learn what doctrine the Church popularly teaches, the main thing which we have to consider, is the practical impression wrought on the popular mind, by those various spiritual appliances which she originates or sanctions. By not sufficiently attending to this undeniable truth, men may often think that the Church does not teach the full doctrine, which she really does teach; while on the other hand they may sometimes fancy that she teaches what she does not. As we are to speak on the Council of Florence in our present number, we will take our illustration of this latter

fact from the doctrine of Purgatory. Father Newman, in the immediate vicinity of that passage which we lately quoted, draws attention to "the pictures of souls in flames," which he "had seen in the streets of Naples" (p. 196). Another popular illustration of Purgatory is taken from the three children of God, praising their Creator in the midst of flames. And it cannot, we think, be fairly denied by any one, that the bodily torment, inflicted by fire, is placed before the whole Catholic flock, with full knowledge and approval of Pope and bishops, as a representation of purgatorial suffering. We infer from this, as the Church's infallible teaching, that the souls in Purgatory undergo a keen anguish, of which a true idea is imparted by the analogy just mentioned. But there is also a scholastic question; viz., whether God inflicts this anguish by means of actual fire, such as our fire on earth, or by means of some different agency. We are not here considering how far, on other grounds, the former alternative is more probable; but the question is evidently quite external to the Church's popular magisterium. That image, under which the mass of Catholics have learned to apprehend purgatorial suffering, is not the action of fire on the *soul*, but on the *body*; and whether the analogous effect is produced on the *soul* by fire, or by some other agency, is a question which they have not even thought of considering.\*

We may take another illustration from the same doctrine. It was in former times debated among theologians, whether the souls in Purgatory are tormented by evil spirits. Now let us make the imaginary supposition, that those pictures of Purgatory, which are exhibited to the Christian flock with pastoral sanction, contained universally a representation of evil spirits inflicting torment. On such a hypothesis, we think that the Church would have practically ruled the question in the affirmative. On the other hand, since such a representation is (we believe) absolutely unheard of, this circumstance

---

\* We commented in our last number on Dr. Pusey's singular stationariness of view; but on this doctrine of Purgatory, he has really taken a very important step forward. "It is absolutely inconceivable," he says (p. 191), "that when the soul shall first behold Jesus, and in His sight, with its powers quickened by Him, shall behold its past life as a whole; when, in His countenance, it shall behold all which it never saw before of His goodness; and in contrast with this, all its own ingratitude, baseness, rebellion, negligence, discontent, murmurings, not to speak of forgiven deadly sin—it should not have intense pain; *pain so intense that one should think that in this life soul and body would be severed by its intensity.*" This does not, of course, come up to the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory; but it is a very important move in that direction. The passage also seems to imply the Catholic doctrine of a particular judgment.

alone affords an extremely strong argument against a notion, which no Catholic of the present day (we suppose) is at all inclined to hold.

There is another question, very closely connected with that of the Church's popular magisterium; viz., the "*sensus fidelium*." Our discussion, therefore, would be most incomplete, if we did not say a few words on the authority due to that "*locus theologicus*." Nor can we introduce the subject better, than by citing the Bishop of Birmingham's excellent work on the Immaculate Conception:—

Nor should the universal conviction of pious Catholics be passed over as of small account in the general argument. For that pious belief, and the devotion which springs from it, *are the faithful reflection of the pastoral teaching*. The more devout the faithful grew, the more devoted they showed themselves towards this mystery. And *it is the devout who have the surest instinct in discerning the mysteries* of which the Holy Spirit breathes the grace through the Church, and who *with as sure a tact reject what is alien from her teaching*. . . .

We cannot do better than listen to the words of the learned Petavius on this part of the subject; for besides their inherent weight, they have been adopted by the greatest writers in treating the subject. "I am inclined," he says, "towards the Immaculate Conception, most especially by that common sentiment which is entertained of it by all the faithful, who have this deeply rooted in the innermost recesses of their minds, and by all the signs and devotions in their power, bear witness that nothing was ever created by God more chaste, more pure, more innocent, more alien, in short, from every condition and stain of sin, than that Virgin. That she truly never did hold anything in common with hell and its ruler the devil, and therefore not with any offence towards God or with damnation." That very grave author, S. Paulinus of Nola, has given us this excellent admonition: "That we should depend upon the spoken sense of all the faithful, because the Spirit of God breathes on each believer." John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester, in the book which he wrote for the king of England against Luther, taught how great is the weight of this universal suffrage of all Catholics, *even when not called forth or demanded by any precept, but spontaneously uttered* (pp. 172-4).

This passage suggests, what we otherwise think certainly true; viz., that there are two different aspects, under which this *sensus fidelium* tells in favour of some doctrine. Firstly, and chiefly, it tells as being "*the faithful reflection of the pastoral teaching*." So far as popular belief affords proof, that some doctrine has been practically taught to the whole Church as indisputably Catholic,—to that extent it affords proof, that the doctrine is infallibly true. But a further hypothesis may be made. Let us suppose, that a certain body of dogma is practically taught everywhere as indisputably Catholic; and that

all those without exception who most apply themselves to the contemplation of that dogma, who are most pure in mind, most detached from worldly things,—that all these men are eager in pressing forward this dogma to some farther consequence. An extremely strong probability hence arises, that this farther consequence is true; yet, until the *Ecclesia Docens* shall have taught it as indisputably Catholic, such probability can never ascend to infallible certainty. Now, until the Immaculate Conception was actually defined, ecclesiastical authority strictly forbade all Catholics from stigmatizing the contradictory tenet with any censure. It appears to us, therefore (though, of course, we speak diffidently and under correction) that until the memorable Dec. 8th, 1854, the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception could not be truly said to possess that infallible certainty, which now obtains, *e.g.*, on the doctrine of her Assumption.\*

So much, then, on the Church's infallibility in her popular magisterium, and on the legitimate weight of the *sensus fidelium*. We now approach a critical and anxious part of our inquiry. From what we have already said, indeed, Dr. Pusey will falsely infer, that we maintain as *de fide* every doctrine taught by the Church's popular magisterium: for he speaks throughout, as though "*de fide*" and "*infallible*" were convertible terms.† Such, however, we need not remind our readers, is far from being the case. Those doctrines only are *de fide*, which have been *revealed by God*; and which are *proposed by the Church as having been thus revealed*. But the Church, as we have so often said, is infallible, not as "*testis*" only, but as "*judex*" and "*magistra*:" not only as witness of those truths which are *de fide*; but also as guide to an indefinite number of further truths, indissolubly mixed up with the former. Now, in her popular magisterium she aims at nothing else than directly training souls for heaven; and for this purpose it more often suffices, to inculcate this or that doctrine as indisputably true, without entering into the question whether it is strictly of faith. It can by no means therefore be inferred, from her popularly teaching some doctrine, that she condemns its denial as precisely *heretical*.

You will ask, then (and this is the anxious inquiry to which we above referred), what kind or degree of theological censure may rightly be ascribed to a rejection of the Church's practical

\* Lugo (*de Fide*, d. 20, n. 76) holds a denial of the Assumption to be beyond question theologically erroneous; but of course he could not at that time so think of a denial of the Immaculate Conception.

† See, *e.g.*, p. 111 and p. 130.



teaching, on this or that particular which is not actually *de fide*. It is absolutely necessary to discuss this question, as will be presently seen; but it is a serious matter to speak about, and we submit our judgment most humbly to that of competent theologians. Our own suggestion would be as follows:—

By far the commonest case surely, where a Catholic is unhappily out of harmony with the Church on any particular included in such teaching, will be for him to deny that this particular *is* really a portion thereof. And there is, of course, great opening for this denial, from the very circumstance, that her popular magisterium is so far less precise and definite than her theological. In such cases, there may often be room, of course, for great suspicion, that this denial arises from want of candour; or of keen desire for spiritual knowledge; or from some other moral defect; but it would be unmeaning to speak of such a denial, as being in itself theologically unsound at all.

But let us suppose him to admit that the Church practically teaches certain doctrines; and to say nevertheless that they have no infallible authority. "What *do* you think of them then?" we ask. "I think," he replies, "that they are unauthoritative inferences from apostolic dogma: some may be true; others, I am fully certain, are not true; but no doctrines are *infallibly* true, except those which the Church actually teaches as an integral portion of the Deposit." If this be the full expression of his mind, no one can possibly charge him with *heresy*; for the Church has never yet proposed, as actually revealed by God, the truth that she is infallible in drawing inferences from the Deposit. Yet we would submit with diffidence that such an opinion is theologically unsound and censurable; though of course the individual may well be invincibly ignorant of its unsoundness, and otherwise admissible to the sacraments.

But a man may imaginably take a much more extreme ground. He may say that the doctrines, taught practically by the Church, inflict a most grave injury on souls, by obscuring those fundamental truths which God has committed to her keeping. Or he may go still further, and say that the former doctrines are absolutely inconsistent with the latter. In either case we do not see how such an opinion can deserve a lower censure, than that of *heretical*: for it directly contradicts the dogma, so undeviatingly proposed by the Church as revealed by God, concerning her own office and prerogative; the dogma, namely, that she is infallibly protected in every age, as the witness and faithful guardian of the Deposit. According to the lesser error above named, she has ceased to be its

faithful guardian ; according to the graver, she has ceased even to be its true witness. And our readers will remember (p. 420) that even the lesser error of the two has been formally pronounced heretical by the Church.

Now on another matter, closely connected with what has gone before.

Dr. Pusey has laid much stress on the circumstance, that the Church's popular teaching often goes far beyond her formal decrees. As to Purgatory, *e. g.*, she teaches practically, as we have seen, that its sufferings are analogously represented by the action of fire on a human body ; whereas her strongest *decree* merely states, that certain souls "are purified after death by purgatorial pains." (Conc. Flor.) Then, as to our Blessed Lady. Those who have derived their notion of the Catholic belief from ecclesiastical decisions alone, would undoubtedly be perplexed and bewildered, when brought across the various manifestations of Catholic devotion. How is this discrepancy to be explained ? F. Newman, in the passage of his "Apologia," to which we have already twice referred, mentions that many Protestants ascribe it to a very discreditable cause ; to the Church's being afraid of explicitly avowing what she implicitly inculcates. His language shows, of course, how widely removed he is from any kind of sympathy with this reply ; but (writing as he does historically and not controversially) he does not pause to refute it. We believe ourselves, that the real account of this matter is as follows :—

The Church is bound by two different duties, which it is most difficult to bring into harmony. On the one hand, the Gospel verities are committed to her keeping ; and she is under the obligation of steadfastly resisting every encroachment, which tends even distantly to corrupt or impair them. On the other hand, she is the one ark of salvation ; and she must open her doors as widely as possible to all who desire heaven. Here, then, is her difficulty. Every new doctrinal decision, however necessary, yet erects a fresh barrier against the salvation of individuals ;\* and she is always desirous, therefore, to the

---

\* We quoted last July a striking passage on this subject, from Monseigneur Pie, bishop of Poitiers :—"Here is interposed," says the bishop, "an objection which has become familiar to the men of our time, even to good sort of men. If it is the Church's duty to guard the truth, it is also her duty to save souls. Now may not too great attention to one of these duties interfere with the fulfilment of the other ? Is the moment well chosen for affirming more strongly and putting forth more precise statements, when the susceptibility of men's mind and the delicacy of their case require rather a tender treatment ? Why not leave in their obscurity those practical or speculative questions, which the last generation never examined very atten-

utmost possible extent, of preserving dogmatic purity by some different means. Take, as one very principal instance, the various Marian doctrines which she practically teaches. Almost all Catholics, who accept the infallible truth of these doctrines, will piously believe that Christ taught them to the Apostles. Yet if the Church formally declared this,—if she propounded them as so many distinct matters of faith,—much evil must arise. There is many a well-intentioned, but half-hearted, or puzzle-headed, or eccentric Catholic, who might shrink from accepting these propositions, when thus rigidly and (as it were) coldly put into scientific shape, and who might thus be seriously tempted to apostasy. Nevertheless, such a man, if remaining a Catholic, might receive indefinite benefit from the Church's sacraments and teaching; might probably save his soul; and would at all events educate as Catholics his children, to become, perhaps, far more loyal sons of the Church than himself. Still more importantly, there is many a non-Catholic, who, as things now are, will submit to the Church; will receive her sweet and gradual training; and under its influence, will learn to sympathize with every high Marian devotion; who might not have had the heart to make so great a venture, had those various truths, which he has thus unconsciously imbibed, been presented to him at first in the nakedness of theological decree: while, moreover, after all, no such decree could really have conveyed to his mind the true doctrine, in that fulness and precision with which faithful Catholics really hold it. Why, then, should the Church throw obstacles in the way of such

tively? In particular, at a time when human society is sick with the one widely-spread malady of naturalism, why so accurately set forth, develope, emphasize, the principles, laws, and whole economy of the supernatural order? Is not this to widen the gulf of existing separations?" *Such was the almost universal cry during the period of Arianism*; and the ambassadors of secular princes held similar language during the deliberations of the Council of Trent. "Why a new and unreasonable declaration, which wears the appearance of aggression? Why a stricter definition or more absolute symbol than in times past? Should not the Church, *in order to maintain her character of visibility and Catholicity*, have regard to her numbers? What will be the advantage of separating from the Church that multitude of vacillating minds, *which might be maintained in her communion by a less explicit formula*? Oftentimes those great bishops, on whom weighed the care of sacred interests, found these protests on the lips even of friends and defenders of the good cause. Animated by the Spirit of God, which is a spirit *both of love and of strength*, those illustrious champions of the Church knew how to unite that consideration which is due to the weak with that inflexibility which orthodoxy demands; and without pronouncing any decrees of exclusion which would have overpassed the end desired, maintained, nevertheless, the special word of doctrine with indomitable tenacity; and defended it with so much authority, interpreted it with so much knowledge, that the doctrine assailed shone forth in irresistible lustre."

persons? What fear is there, that they will impede the general reception of integral and pure Marian doctrine? That doctrine (thank God!) lives in the heart of the Catholic masses; and any individual is absolutely powerless (even if he wished it) to stem the popular tide.

Such, then, are the principles which we uphold, on the Church's popular magisterium; and we must next apply those principles to the Eirenicon. Now the general question of devotion to Mary is quite large enough to occupy an entire article; and we have engaged to enter on it at length hereafter. Yet, in order to appreciate Dr. Pusey's various propositions, it is very important that we briefly and generally explain, what are those doctrines concerning her, which we maintain to be authoritatively, and therefore infallibly, taught by the Church. They are, we think, such as these:—(1.) That her merits are incomparably greater than those of any other created person. (2.) That, accordingly, she occupies a place in heaven incomparably nearer to her Son than any other. (3.) That she is intimately acquainted with the thoughts, the character, the circumstances, of all who invoke her aid; and well knows what is really for their greatest good. (4.) That she has incomparably greater power than any other created person, towards promoting that good. (5.) That to unite ourselves with Mary in the contemplation of Jesus, as is done *e.g.* by those who duly recite the Rosary, is a singularly efficacious means, for vividly apprehending His Divine Personality and His various mysteries. (6.) That the unremitting and most loving thought of her has an efficacy, peculiarly its own, in promoting a tender and practical love of Him. (7.) That that temper of mind is most acceptable to Almighty God, in which the thought of Jesus and of Mary is inseparably blended.\* (8.) That regular and repeated prayer to her cannot be omitted by a Catholic, without putting his salvation into grievous peril. Other propositions might be added to these: and the proof which we would allege, of such propositions being really contained in the Church's authoritative teaching, is this:—If any one of them were denied—the exhortations impressed on Catholics throughout Christendom, with full approbation of Pope and bishops, would be baseless and indefensible; influential religious habits, whose growth is sedulously fostered by ecclesiastical

---

\* For ourselves, we greatly sympathize with the Italian priest mentioned by Dr. Pusey, in p. 108, note. When the dying person commended herself to "Jesus," instead of to "Jesus and Mary," his comment was "these English are but half converts."

authority, would be founded on a delusion; the Church would have in fact made a mistake, unspeakably serious, in that very matter,—the training of souls for heaven,—which is the one ultimate end for which she was endowed with infallibility.

Again, there are other propositions which, if not actually taught by the Church with infallible authority, are yet so universally held by devout servants of Mary, that no "*cordatus Catholicus*" will dream of doubting them. For instance, that God secured her assent as an indispensable preliminary to the Incarnation ("*fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum*") *which otherwise would not have been accomplished*; that while our Lord was on earth, she had a clear knowledge of, and keen sympathy with, all which He effected for our salvation; that she takes a most active part in dispensing the gift of perseverance; that extraordinary tenderness towards her is a special note of predestination. Lastly, there are other pious opinions, more or less in excess of what has been above stated, which have been advocated by this or that individual, with the Church's full permission. Of these, we would earnestly maintain that they contain nothing theologically unsound; yet, since the Church does not herself teach them, they may be of course to any extent mistaken. At the same time, from the manifest tendency of the Church to permit what appear at first sight extreme expressions on this matter, she does seem authoritatively (and therefore infallibly) to teach, that, *in themselves*, they are not spiritually dangerous, though they might be so to particular individuals.

We think Dr. Pusey quite correct, in alleging Marian devotion as far the most striking exhibition of that difference, on which he so much insists, between the Church's formal and her practical teaching; and whatever we say on this, may be easily accommodated to other instances. And that we may do justice to Dr. Pusey's argument, it is absolutely necessary to consider the various ways in which a candidate for admission into the Church may regard this practical teaching. We will put aside for a moment the question of *corporate* admission, and confine ourselves to the case of individuals; and we will (to the best of our power) apply the general principles above laid down. Nor of course do we forget, that the various states of mind, which actually exist in different individuals, are incapable of being definitely separated into distinct classes; since they melt into each other gradually and imperceptibly. Yet we cannot make our meaning clear, unless we speak of the classes as altogether distinct. Moreover, here again we most humbly submit all which we suggest to the judgment of competent theologians.

One candidate for reception will speak thus : "These constant prayers to Mary are quite external to my previous experience, and I shrink altogether from plunging into them headlong. Yet I see that the Church sanctions them ; and I have no doubt therefore in my own mind that they are pleasing to God. By degrees I shall probably understand and practise them myself." To say the least, there is nothing reprehensible in this. At the same time such a postulant as we have supposed, when he has once become a Catholic, will probably advance very far more speedily than he had thought possible, in sympathy even with the more extreme forms of Marian doctrine.

Another not only dislikes these devotions, but blinds himself to the fact that the Church sanctions and encourages them. He intends, on becoming a Catholic, to content himself with a comparatively sparing worship of Mary. However a priest might advise such a person, he could feel no difficulty of course in receiving him.

A third may actually recognise that the Church practically teaches these things ; and may yet regard them as being unauthoritative, and in an indefinite degree mistaken, additions to the Deposit. Here one must of course speak with more reserve, and much may depend on circumstances of individual character or habit. But looking at the thing generally, it may be assumed that he is invincibly ignorant on the obligation of believing what the Church practically teaches ; and it may be the dictate of charity, not to attempt the removal of such ignorance. On his reception, he will witness a totally new scene, and breathe a totally new atmosphere ; the sacraments of the Church will strengthen and enlighten him ; a totally new form of teaching will be presented to him ; and everything may be hoped for the result.

But now suppose a Protestant to hold, not merely that these doctrines are unauthoritative and partly mistaken, but that they are certainly false ; and moreover, that they are inexpressibly mischievous, as obscuring those fundamental truths of religion, which it is the Church's office to exhibit in their clearest light. We have seen that such a view is expressly condemned by the Church as heretical ; and even had it not been so condemned, its heretical nature is abundantly manifest. No man could be received into the Church therefore without renouncing it.

And still less, if he held that these doctrines are not only thus injurious, but that they are directly contradictory, to the Apostolic Deposit.

Now we wish we could see any room for possible doubt, that Dr. Pusey's views must be ranked in one or other of these



two latter classes. He considers (p. 111) that the doctrines on Mary, practically taught by the Roman Catholic Church, "*come as near to idolatry as can be supposed in a Church, of which it is said 'the idols he shall utterly abolish.'*" Also (p. 113) "that the vast system" practically encouraged by Rome, "does practically occasion *many* uninstructed minds to stop short in the mediation of S. Mary;" *i.e.*, to forget our Lord's mediatorial office. Further (p. 143) that "where the natural language [of Anglicans] would be 'God will do this or that,' there it seems equally natural to Roman Catholics to say, 'Mary will do it;'" by which we understand him to mean, that the prevalent teaching about Mary tends to banish from a mind the thought of God. "It is difficult to see," he says elsewhere (p. 183), "*how direct heresy should not be suggested by sentences such as these (and they are so common), 'If we fear to go directly to Jesus Christ . . . let us boldly implore the aid of Mary our Mother.'*" Such sentences are indeed most common, and most fully permitted by the Church; yet Dr. Pusey thinks that they suggest direct heresy.

He is speaking throughout, be it remembered, of a "practical system" (p. 210) "*taught by her priests, put forth as certain truth and as her teaching in books which have the sanction of her bishops, and by writers who have been canonized:*" for which most assuredly therefore she "remains responsible." Of this system he says (p. viii.) that it "interferes with the simple and exclusive reliance on Jesus;" also (p. 151), that "*the most startling fact is its completeness. It shocked us to find,*" &c., &c. He would not have been "shocked," unless this system were seriously prejudicial to piety and spirituality. Indeed, he thinks this whole mass of practical belief so disastrous, that a vast apostacy from the faith may possibly result therefrom (p. 258). Lastly, on "a practical question affecting our whole eternity" (p. 182), he considers that Rome gives an answer both false and unspeakably pernicious.\*

It is quite impossible, we think, for any one to read these passages—and still more to read them in their respective contexts—and to doubt that Dr. Pusey holds one of the two gravest errors above recited. We have already given reasons for our opinion, that either of these errors is a heresy; and we have

---

\* "The one is a practical question affecting our whole eternity: 'What shall I do to be saved?' The practical answer to the Roman Catholic seems to me to be '*Go to Mary and you will be saved;*' in our dear Lord's own words, it is, 'Come unto Me;' in our own belief it is, 'Go to Jesus, and you will be saved.'"

quoted the Church's express definition, in support of our opinion. We conclude, that however invincible may be Dr. Pusey's ignorance, however admirable his intentions, however pious his life, he cannot be admitted (until he abandons such heresy) into the One Catholic Church.

As to his wish that the Roman authorities should give some assurance against such doctrines being taught to their English flock;—if called on to speak, they would, of course, give just the opposite assurance. They would frankly promise to take every available method of spreading a devotion, which is infallibly guaranteed as true in principle, and which is demonstrated by experience as so inestimably beneficial in practice.

After having read such passages as those above recited—passages which no one could imagine Dr. Pusey having put forth without extreme deliberation, and under a most painful sense of duty,—we were more astonished than we can well express, by the following words in his letter to the *Weekly Register*. "I did not write," he says, "as a reformer, but on the defensive. *It is not for us to prescribe to Italians or Spaniards what they shall hold, or how they shall express their pious opinions.* All which we wish is to have it made certain, by authority, that we should not, in case of reunion, be obliged to hold them ourselves." Now we cannot comment on these extraordinary words, without expressing our sense of the truly kind and humble spirit which they seem to display: indeed, in this, as in so many other exhibitions of himself, Dr. Pusey presents the appearance of a kindly and humble man, possessed (as though through some Satanic agency) by a most unkindly and proud theory. But surely the passage we have just quoted shows the strangest inaccuracy of thought. In Dr. Pusey's opinion "*Italians and Spaniards,*"—nay Englishmen also, of the Roman communion—accept heartily a devotion close upon idolatry; which tends to banish the thought of God; which suggests direct heresy; which speaks most falsely and perniciously, on a question affecting our whole eternity; which is so monstrous, that it may not improbably end in producing a widely-extended apostacy from the Faith. All this he thinks himself at liberty confidently to think, and loudly to express. Yet he will not venture to tell Italians and Spaniards, that they had better abandon this devotion. Where then is his Christian charity? Where his zeal for God's glory? Is it Englishmen only, whose salvation he desires? Otherwise, why should he not "*prescribe to Italians and Spaniards*" what he so energetically prescribes to his fellow-countrymen? If he believes one-tenth part of what he says on Marian devotion, in what possible spirit (as an

honest man) could he enter the Roman Catholic Church, except in the spirit of "a reformer"?

It will further have been seen that, by some inexplicable oversight, those very devotions which he has denounced as verging on idolatry, are now leniently characterized as the "expression" of men's "pious opinions." Why, then, may not Englishmen also, if God draws them to it, "express their pious opinions" in a similar shape?

Presently he continues:—"Least of all did I think of imputing to any of the writers whom I quoted, that they took from our Lord any of the love which they gave to His Mother. I was intent only on describing the system...I had not the least thought of criticising holy men who held it." We do wish he would consider the force of his own words. In S. Alphonsus, in the Venerable Grignon de Montfort (whom he constantly quotes), and in a thousand other like-minded men—next to their personal love of God and of their Saviour—there was no more conspicuous characteristic of their whole interior life, than their enthusiastic devotion to Mary. Dr. Pusey, in his work, describes this devotion as totally unfounded and unspeakably mischievous; and then protests in his letter, that he has had "no thought of criticising these holy men." To say that they were victims to a mischievous superstition, he considers to have been no criticism at all.

He thinks, moreover, that none of them took from our Lord that love which they gave to His Mother. But if so, their love of Mary must have been to them a vast blessing. To love tenderly, and contemplate unremittingly, a spotlessly holy creature, will be admitted by every pious man to be in itself a vast blessing. Protestants, however, commonly think that this blessing cannot be obtained, without paying for it too high a price; without taking from our Lord a large portion of that love which they give to His Mother. Now Dr. Pusey considers this objection chimerical, at all events in the case of holy men; and he must think, therefore, that their love of Mary is an unmixed and vast blessing to them. In other words, he thinks that they derive an unmixed and vast blessing from giving their assent to a most false and pernicious system of religious teaching.

It may seem ungracious to take advantage (as it were) of Dr. Pusey's gentle and amiable expressions; but surely he cannot be permitted, at once to hunt with the hounds and to run with the hare. Does he, or does he not, deliberately hold to those violent criticisms, which he has expressed in his volume? If he does not, he is bound expressly to retract them. If he does, we know how he and we mutually stand: we give him every

credit for the best intentions; but we must wage against him an internecine conflict, in behalf of doctrines which are dearer to us than life itself.

The same thing holds of the other Unionists in his communion. They are confident that their own society is part of the Visible Church; but they wish to promote unity and peace by a concordat with Rome. Unity and peace! Why their entry among us with their present dispositions (if it were possible, as, thank God, it is not) would be the signal for a bitter and violent contention, in comparison with which all other ecclesiastical quarrels of the day would fall into insignificance. The supreme authorities of the Roman Catholic Church teach a large scheme of doctrine as infallibly true; and they enforce it practically on every one of her members, as a most prominent portion of his religious creed. A body of converts, forsooth, is to enter that Church, in an attitude of violent rebellion against these authorities, and denouncing this very scheme of doctrine as pernicious and anti-Christian. "O, Liberty!" it has been said, "what tyranny is perpetrated in thy name!" And we may exclaim, in like manner: O, Peace! how rankling is the animosity, how cruel the warfare, promoted in thy name by thy most loudly protesting votaries!

No. There is an issue between Dr. Pusey and ourselves, of unspeakable gravity. Let us aim on both sides, by every appropriate method, in the presence of God, and under a grave sense of responsibility, at rightly apprehending the truth. But, in the name of sober common sense, let us not fancy that we can compromise, or ignore, or shirk it, by mechanical plans of ecclesiastical re-organisation.

But Dr. Pusey speaks further, of "harmonizing" the Anglican "maximum" with the Roman "minimum." This serves as a text for one of the very best passages in Canon Oakeley's pamphlet.

Dr. Pusey has spoken with approval of the dictum of some Italian nobleman, who is reported to have said, that a point of contact for union might be found between the Catholic minimum and Anglican maximum. I hardly think that, if he had a clear idea of a Catholic minimum, he would feel it to be a possible basis of such a union as he could approve. To suppose that a substantial religious compound could be formed out of the weakest elements of Catholic and the strongest of Anglican truth, is to overlook the ethical bearings of doctrine, and to reduce the subject to the unreal form of a mere question of intellectual assent to certain barren articles of faith. We ought rather to look at the matter in the concrete, and to imagine, if it be possible the character of a minimum Catholic engrafted on that of a maximum Anglican. My own belief is that the theory would vanish, like the logical riddle of Achilles and the tortoise, under the stern operation of a practical

experiment ; and that a mere nondescript being would be the product of an attempt to fuse into union such heterogeneous constituents. My idea of the character of a minimum Catholic will be best conveyed by a rough sketch of what I conceive to be its leading features, with allowance for circumstantial varieties which do not affect the essence of the picture. What may be the minimum Catholic of Italy or France I have no better means of determining than are also at Dr. Pusey's command. But I think I know in what shape this sort of Catholic would come out in England. He is one, then, who considers belief to be a burden, not a privilege, and who, therefore, believes no more than he can help. In ecclesiastical politics he scarcely rises to the Gallican level. *He has more fellow-feeling with his non-Catholic countrymen than with Catholics, however excellent, of other countries ; that is to say, he prefers his country to the Church.* He is, therefore, more sensitive to the rights of the Queen and constitution than of the Pope ; not, of course, that he should disregard the former, but that he should especially prize the latter. He dislikes our popular devotions, not only those which relate to the Blessed Virgin, but others also, considering them superfluous and rather sentimental. He wishes priests to be "men of the world ;" not in the sense of being experimentally alive to its delusions, or of meeting it half way in its own line with a view to subduing it, but of copying its ways, mingling indiscriminately with its societies, and entering with undue zest into its peculiar interests. I half suspect that he is secretly disinclined to clerical celibacy ; but upon this subject the feeling is happily too strong to allow of his giving public expression to a sentiment so unpopular. However, he has no scruple about advocating marriages between Catholics and Protestants, as tending to break down invidious distinctions. *He prefers mixed to exclusive education ;* he sets more store by the social than by the especially supernatural virtues, and is half inclined to doubt whether the latter have any real existence, except in the pages of saintly biography, or in the exhortations of enthusiastic preachers. He doubts the advantage of Religious Orders, excepting, perhaps, those of the female sex which attend the hospitals. He abhors the Irish as a dreamy unpractical people, taking little or no account of their faith and piety. He is inclined to think that objective Truth is a chimera, and a dogmatic religion the most indefensible of tyrannies ; he considers that religious differences are all capable of being cleared up by mutual explanation ; and that, at last, if a man be a good citizen and a good neighbour, his creed is of the less importance, since the poet has said—

"He can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

The formal recognition of a low standard of Catholic doctrine as a basis of union, will have no other effect than that of multiplying such sorry specimens of the religious character as I have just described. Is it to effect a result such as this, that Dr. Pusey would employ the latest energies of a life, laboriously and honourably spent in the inculcation and exemplification of principles the very reverse of those on which such a character is founded ; and this, too, at the moment when he is striving to borrow from Rome the light and help which may enable him to realize more perfectly the ideal of

Catholic loyalty and Catholic sanctity, to which he finds the resources at his command avowedly unequal ? (pp. 54-57).

We may develop Canon Oakeley's argument, somewhat as follows. On what ground do genuine Catholics denounce so sorry a specimen of their religion, as the author has here described? They have no sufficient reason for denying that in strictness he is a Catholic: but they say that he is an unsound and disloyal one; that his views, if not heretical, are unsound and censurable. On what grounds do they base this charge? Because he contents himself with a grudging acceptance, of what the Church has peremptorily laid down as the condition of his being a Catholic at all; because he will not accept, on her authority, her most formal instructions, which are not actual definitions of faith; because he does not regard her practice, as the one authentic interpretation of her decrees; because he pays no deference to the spirit of her teaching, and to the various unmistakable expressions of her mind. But all this is the very thing which Dr. Pusey wishes the Church to legitimize and sanction. He wishes, in fact, to establish a principle, in virtue of which such a poor creature as Canon Oakeley has described, should be accounted, rather than any other, the true model of a Catholic.

Such, we are convinced, is no legitimate exhibition of Dr. Pusey's real temper. If we may express our own augury of his future, it would be this. He is mainly retained where he is, by a most misplaced reverence and affection for the Church of England. The hope of his conversion is precisely proportionate to the hope of his throwing off that reverence and affection. If, by God's grace, he did so, we are confident that he would be disposed, by the very same habit of mind, to feel enthusiastic loyalty towards the Church of Christ. And for this reason, we think he would find himself far more at home with what is called the more "extreme" portion of Catholics, than with those who call *themselves* moderate, and are called by their opponents disloyal.

We have now encountered two of Dr. Pusey's misconceptions: (1.) His strange notion that permanent Christian unity could possibly be obtained, through a federation of independent societies; and (2.) his impression that the Roman Catholic Church claims no infallibility for her practical teaching. A third misconception, as we said, remains. We referred to it at the outset of this article; we have referred to it in this REVIEW more than once before. To speak of "stipulations" for union at all, is to mistake the fundamental principles of that Roman



Catholic Church with which he desires to be united. That she is exclusively the One Catholic Apostolic Church; that apart from her communion (except for invincible ignorance) no man can be saved;—this is not merely an essential doctrine of her Faith, but it is the one corner-stone, on which her whole ecclesiastical fabric is built. There are no Roman Catholic priests in the world, who would dare to receive Dr. Pusey into communion with Rome, until he should profess that he had hitherto lived externally to Christ's visible Church. Now, we are not at all denying (of course not) that a very stable conviction may most reasonably be waited for, in order to so serious a step as change of communion; nor, again, are we denying that with many men (though certainly not with all) the acquirement of such conviction is a gradual, nay (if you will) a slow, process. All this is beside the question. Until he have acquired this stable conviction that his own communion is schismatical, no Anglican can be received into the Roman Catholic Church; but so soon as he *has* acquired it, he is formally committing mortal sin and meriting Hell, if he delay his firm resolve of unreserved submission. What then can possibly be meant by "negotiation," "terms of union," and the like? He is under an actual obligation,—either of remaining or of moving—according to his conscientious conviction on a certain doctrinal issue. If he has one certain conviction, he formally commits mortal sin by remaining; if he has *not* that one conviction, he *cannot* become a Roman Catholic till he acquires it. But how can that conviction be affected one way or the other—how can it be either accelerated or retarded—by the assent, or otherwise, of Rome to certain concessions and conditions?

Now let us not here be misunderstood. A truly loyal son of the Church might, without any kind of inconsistency, supplicate ecclesiastical authorities in such language as this:—"Here in England exhibit more sparingly, we pray you, public devotion to Mary;" or again, "veneration of images;" or again, "introduce a far larger amount of vernacular prayers than is now ordinary;" or, "let your translation of Scripture be in more idiomatic English." "So," he might add, "will you remove many a prejudice from our fellow-countrymen; many a misconception on the true nature of our creed; many a barrier which now closes against them the light of truth." We should ourselves be removed in the furthest possible extent from uniting in any such supplication; and we will presently give a few reasons for our dissent from it. But we are on that very account the more forward in admitting, that such a supplication to authority would be in no respect con-

demned by the particular argument which we are now enforcing.

What we mean to criticise is this:—It is constantly implied—sometimes expressly said—by Anglican Unionists, that if the Roman Church would but accede to this or that list of concessions, they would joyfully, as an united body, join her communion; but that otherwise they cannot in conscience bring themselves so to do. We would thus address any one of their number:—You don't of course contemplate the formal commission of mortal sin; and so soon, therefore, as you are really convinced of the Roman claim, you will not delay for a moment your resolve of unreserved submission. Now, this Roman claim rests on certain motives of credibility which have their own intrinsic weight; which deserve—and which (we cannot doubt) receive—your earnest attention, accompanied with sincere prayer for light. Nor of course can these motives of credibility depend, one way or other, in the slightest degree, on Rome's concession, or non-concession, of certain disciplinary proposals. Your statement then comes to this:—(1) You prophesy with absolute confidence, that these motives of credibility will not convince you, unless this concession be made; (2) you prophesy with equal confidence, that if it *is* made, they *will* convince you; nay (3) you prophesy the same thing with equal confidence, in regard to a number of other individuals who are acting with you in concert. Lastly, and perhaps still more strangely than all the rest, you call this augury or prophecy by the strange name of a "resolve." You *will* forsooth join Rome if she concede; and you will not join her if she do not. We do not, of course, insult your common sense—or rather deny your sanity—by supposing that you *mean* all which we have just drawn out; yet there is nothing else which you *can* mean, consistently with the facts of the case. For we do not of course suspect for a moment that you intend, with your eyes open, to incur damnation, by refusing to fulfil an obligation which you recognize as divinely imposed,—that of submission to Rome,—because she refuses some disciplinary concession which you desire.

You will reply, perhaps, that it is this very exclusiveness of Roman claim, which is the great enemy to Christian union; that it is this exclusiveness, which you combat and wish to remove. Well, then, we understand you. You are an Unionist, just in the sense in which Dr. Cumming and Mr. Spurgeon are Unionists; for they, no less than you, would rejoice to promote Christian union, by inducing Roman Catholics to apostatize from their Faith.

We have never been able to hear even the suggestion of a

reply to this reasoning, except by an appeal to the Council of Florence. The Pope, it is said, in holding that Council, sanctioned that very principle of corporate union, which our arguments would call into question altogether. We will consider that Council therefore carefully in a separate article.

We must not conclude, however, without noticing two points which may be plausibly raised against us by the Unionist party. Firstly, then, a member of that party may address to us the following objection:—"You have admitted, after all, in this very article, that truth is not *invariably* to be placed before peace; you have admitted that this or that doctrine—even though infallibly sanctioned by the Church—may yet under peculiar circumstances be legitimately waived and put into abeyance, for the sake of Christian harmony. But in admitting this, you emphatically condemn the course undeviatingly pursued by you gentlemen of the DUBLIN REVIEW. Let me take two tenets, which you have been forward in advocating: viz. (1.) The infallibility of Papal Encyclicals or Allocutions; and (2.) The legitimacy and advisableness, in certain countries, of the Catholic ruler refusing civil toleration to heretics. You will certainly admit that no tenets can tend more powerfully than these, to inflame differences and exasperate spirits. Let me grant, then, for argument's sake (what in fact I totally deny), that these tenets are true; yet, have you not been arguing in this very article, that the Church will often, under circumstances, forbear from insisting on what she regards as true, that Christian unity may be the better promoted? From your own mouths we judge you, reckless and mischievous firebrands that you are."

Such an objection may have occurred to many readers: it undoubtedly requires an answer, and we will express our answer with the utmost frankness. But we must first state our own principle somewhat more distinctly. There is a large body of truths, taught by God to the Apostles, and proposed by the Church as having been thus taught. These constitute the Deposit of Faith; and they are earnestly inculcated by the Church, in all places and under all circumstances. There is further a large body of doctrines, infallibly determined by the Church, which are intimately connected indeed with the Deposit, but are no integral part thereof. In regard to any one of *these* doctrines, there is a possibility, we admit, that under particular circumstances more harm than good may be done by its prominent exhibition. Supposing, therefore, a Catholic is called to account for bringing forward tenets, which cause

public prejudice against the Church;—he gives no sufficient answer to the charge, by proving that these tenets are true; or even that the Church has infallibly sanctioned them: he was bound also to consider, whether their enforcement at this particular moment were according to the rules of Christian prudence.

Now, this very principle is urged against us to our condemnation. But let our readers carefully observe the qualification, with which we have invariably accompanied it. Under particular circumstances, no doubt, the interests of the Church and of the Faith are better promoted, by waiving some indubitable doctrine, than by insisting on it. *But who is to judge on the existence of such circumstances?* We answer emphatically, the Church. The problem involved is so complex and intricate, that no individual can, without the wildest presumption, dream of solving it for himself. It is the Church, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, which alone is competent to point out the true course. We are speaking throughout, as above explained, not on the dogmata of faith, but on other doctrines connected with those dogmata. And just as it is to the Church alone that we look, when we desire to know which of these doctrines are infallibly true;—so it is to the Church alone that we look, when we desire to know which of these doctrines, *being* infallibly true, should, under particular circumstances, be prominently and urgently enforced.

Here, then, is our vindication. We have laid earnest stress on the two tenets, named above by our imaginary opponent. Why have we laid on them such earnest stress? Not through any trust in our own private judgment, but because the Church herself called on us so to do; because in these times a Catholic writer would have disloyally failed in his allegiance, had he acted otherwise. For several years past, the Holy Father has been energetically summoning all Catholics to hold interiorly a certain doctrine on his civil principedom. But this doctrine neither is, nor possibly can be, defined as of faith; he has therefore been energetically summoning all Catholics, to hold interiorly a certain doctrine which is not of faith. It is the Pope himself then, “the vicerent of Christ,” “the teacher of Christians,” who has summoned Catholic writers to vindicate the due authority of those doctrinal determinations, which are not definitions of faith. Nor has he been less emphatic, whether by word or action, in denouncing that anti-Catholic principle, called “liberty of conscience,” which he and his predecessors have so often condemned under its various shapes. The “*Mirari vos*”—the recent Encyclical and Syllabus—use expressions quite as strong as any which we have employed; or

rather considerably stronger. And here, indeed, is an inquiry, which we would earnestly press on the attention of those who think that our language on the Pope has been "extreme." Can any one statement be named, which we have made concerning the Pope, which he has not first made concerning himself? Any attribute or prerogative claimed for him by us, which he has not himself been the first to bring publicly forward? Any decision of his maintained by us to be infallible, which he has not himself enforced on the Church as uttered by an infallible voice? It has been our one wish, our highest ambition, to follow humbly his authoritative guidance,—not only as to what doctrines we shall *believe*, but also as to what doctrines we shall urgently proclaim and vindicate.

The second objection, above supposed, regards not doctrine but discipline; and it will come rather from a Catholic Unionist, than from an Anglican. "The Church, you admit,—specially "in her dealings with the East—has made several important "disciplinary concessions, in order that those barriers might "be more effectually removed, which would otherwise keep back "the light from its due access to their mind. Why then are "you unwilling that she should do that in favour of Anglican "Unionists, which she has done on so large a scale in favour "of Eastern schismatics?"

Now, if ecclesiastical authority were, in fact, to make any such concessions as are here advocated, we should have no doubt at all that they were expedient; so strongly are we convinced that, on such a matter, the judgment of authority is immeasurably more trustworthy than our own. But as yet neither has it done so, nor shown the slightest disposition to do it; and we are left, perforce, to our own private judgment. Now, our own private judgment strongly points to the conclusion, that nothing could well be more injurious to Christian union, than the slightest concession of the kind. Never was there a broader contrast of character on the face of this earth, than between a Greek schismatic of the fifteenth century, and an Anglican Unionist of the nineteenth. No men were ever less addicted to private judgment than the former. They received, with most unquestioning belief and veneration, the traditions of their fathers; the teachings of their bishops and priests; the time-honoured observances of their communion. The Church's main end, then, was this: that as far as possible every object of their veneration should remain in itself untouched; while they should gradually learn more and more to look up to the Roman See, as to the one earthly authority, from which the whole derives its ultimate sanction. To enforce changes, therefore, in their ritual and practice, would have

been to damage that very temper of loyal submission, which was Rome's best security for the permanence of union.

But if any man ever lived, who exhibited the principle of private judgment in its most naked features and its extremest shape, it is the Anglican Unionist. We are not here speaking at all of Dr. Pusey: on the contrary, his reverence for Anglicanism—greatly as it astounds us—is, to our mind, one of his most attractive and hopeful characteristics. But, as to the ordinary Unionist, he spends his life in setting ecclesiastical authority at defiance. He despises the tradition of his fathers; he despises his own bishops; he despises Rome;\* and, if he were brought into contact with Greeks, he would, no doubt, despise them equally. He has instituted an agitation for a scheme of union hitherto unheard of, and is busy in getting proselytes for this scheme of his own invention. Then consider the ritualistic movement. It is carried on, against the vehement protest of all whom he accounts his spiritual governors; and it must be the means of more and more hardening him, against the very idea of humble and unquestioning submission. Such a man cannot become an endurable Catholic, until he have learned to distrust profoundly his own private judgments and impressions; to seek earnestly for supernatural guidance; to realize the all-important truth, that the Church is commissioned to teach him, and not he to teach the Church. If a large body of men, otherwise minded, obtained unhappily admission among us, we can anticipate nothing but violent and relentless conflicts against authority, issuing in some widely-extended apostasy. Now every disciplinary concession, even the very slightest, made in favour of such men, does but confirm them in that wild delusion about "negotiations" and "conditions," which (so long as it remains) must utterly incapacitate them for permanent Christian unity.

A very few words will sum up our general argument. Since Rome is infallible, union with her cannot be accomplished, except on her own dogmatic basis; *i.e.*, by the method of absolute and unreserved submission to her authority. Those who deny the obligation of such submission, are contending

---

\* For instance, see the *Union Review* of last November (p. 635). "With Rome . . . the older the child grows, the heavier become the restrictions; and every year Papal Encyclicals narrow the limits beyond which the utterance of thought is forbidden . . . The consequence is that a *powerful and energetic mind is necessarily ill at ease in the Roman communion* . . . its Dollingers are suspected, its Passaglias are sickened, its Lacordaires are treated coldly, its Oxenham's meet with contempt, and every departure from the ever narrowing groove is regarded as an act of rebellion."



against God's ordinance, and are the enemies of Gospel Truth. To say that, in opposing these men, we betray indifference to the blessedness of Christian unity, is simply unmeaning. As well might it be said that S. Athanasius betrayed such indifference, when he laboured to eject Arian bishops; or S. Paul, when he anathematized even an angel from Heaven, who should preach any other Gospel than that already delivered.

---

#### ART. VI.—CHAMPAGNY'S ROMAN EMPIRE.

*Les Césars.* Par le Comte FRANZ DE CHAMPAGNY. Paris: Ambroise Bray.  
*Rome et la Judée au Temps de la Chute de Néron* (ans 66-72 après Jésus-Christ). Par le Comte F. DE CHAMPAGNY.

*Les Antonins* (ans de Jésus-Christ 69-180). Par le Comte DE CHAMPAGNY.

WE owe our readers an apology for not having earlier invited their attention to the historical works of the Count de Champagne. They have for some years obtained a degree of popularity in France which would render any recommendation there quite needless. In England we have been surprised to find them unknown, not merely to persons of general intelligence, but to some whose attention has been specially directed to the Roman empire. This is the more to be regretted because we have no work in our own language which exactly supplies their place. Neither is it at all likely that such a work will be written. We have, indeed, from Mr. Merivale an able, learned, and interesting history of the "Romans under the Empire." But no man whose eyes have not been opened by the gift of faith can fully understand the history of those centuries, of which the one great and distinguishing event was the fulfilment of that prophecy of our Divine Lord, "The kingdom of Heaven is like to leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened." Mr. Merivale's tone, of course, is as different as possible from that of Gibbon. Dr. Newman quotes (in "The Church of the Fathers," if we remember right) a sentence from a distinguished Anglican, regretting that the best English writer upon ecclesiastical history should be an infidel. The fact is, that Gibbon's history is in great measure ecclesiastical, because his hatred of Christianity made him instinctively feel its presence, even where it was not prominently put forward, as

some people are conscious when a cat is hidden in the room. Mr. Merivale's attitude towards Christianity is as different as possible, and if he wrote an ecclesiastical history it would be a contrast to that of Gibbon. But this is not an ecclesiastical history at all. It is only when the Church is forced upon his attention that it is noticed at all. He represents a class of minds which we suppose hardly exists except in Protestant countries,—in our day we might probably have said, except in England. He believes in the truth of Christianity; he would, no doubt, be shocked to hear it doubted, much more denied; but he falls into the popular English notion, that, true as Christianity is, and important as it is in its own sphere, it is intended only for certain particular times and places. In fact, Christianity is a Sunday matter. And especially, when we read heathen histories of heathen times, and desire as much as possible to see things as they were seen by the contemporaries of Augustus or of Nero, a word about Christianity and the Christian Church would be as much out of place as if we were to fancy to ourselves Alexander the Great invading America and fighting with Montezuma (as poor Oliver Goldsmith was nearly betrayed into recording in his "History of Greece"). Even under the Antonines Christianity is, in Mr. Merivale's view, very little more prominent. Hence, with one or two short, but, we doubt not, quite sincere recognitions of its truth, it is as a general rule simply ignored and forgotten in the greater part of his history.

Of course his explanation of this, to himself as well as to others, would be, that he undertook to tell the story of the Roman Empire as it has been told to us by Tacitus, Suetonius, &c., and that if there was nothing in Christianity which arrested their attention, there could be nothing which he was at liberty to mention. This, however, is simply to mistake the duty of an historian. He has to tell what is true and nothing else. But if events of the highest importance, destined to produce most momentous results upon the happiness and welfare of many nations, were really in progress in the country and age of which he is writing, and if he has any means of tracing their development, nothing could be more absurd than that he should pass them over without notice, merely because they worked so gradually and secretly as not to arrest, at the time, the attention even of keen observers. Christianity then claims the special attention of the historian of the Roman Empire, not merely because it is the truth, and alone discloses our relations with the unseen world; but even upon much lower grounds, because its progress even (had it been a merely human event) would have

been by far the most momentous event of those times; and, therefore, the most proper subject of the historian, even if he were personally without religion. And this would be even more his duty if so important an event had been overlooked by contemporary heathen writers, for history is never more strictly in her proper task than when she is tracing to their earliest beginnings events which have afterwards developed themselves into an importance as unforeseen as it is momentous.

Let us give an example of what we mean. The introduction of standing armies was unquestionably the most important political change in the history of modern Europe. When introduced in one nation all were obliged to follow the example. This at once made it impossible to continue the system of government which prevailed everywhere during the middle ages. On the Continent it led to despotic government, in England to the supremacy of Parliament. It has introduced the system of "great powers," instead of that before existing, of a multitude of small states with the Holy Father for the arbiter of all. It threatens results still more important; the absolute domination of two or three states, perhaps of one. Now Hallam seems to prove that this system was silently introduced by Charles VII. of France, when he was restoring some degree of order after the murderous devastation caused by the English wars. It can hardly be doubted that a contemporary Frenchman must have thought it far less important than the marriage of a daughter of France with a prince of the blood, or the wresting of some petty fortress from the English. But great as this change was, incalculably greater was the change which was working, unobserved and unremembered, in the Roman Empire, during the centuries of which the Count of Champagny and Mr. Merivale have written. This must be admitted even by unbelievers, for even they cannot shut their eyes to the fact, that the spread of Christianity, however little they may love it, was at least the most important event in history. What M. Champagny then has done, is to trace the progress and effects of this great event in its earlier stages; while the fashion with historians has been to shut their eyes and turn away their thoughts from it altogether, until at last, in the time of Constantine and his successors, it forced itself upon them. Which of the two is most worthy of a philosopher we need hardly say; even if Christianity had been merely a human philosophy, and not, as it is, the one remedy revealed by God for the evils of this world, as well as the only hope and light for that which is still unseen.

We sincerely believe that this merit of our author (and a

great merit it is) is, in fact, the main fault which has been found in him by Protestant readers and critics. The *Saturday Review*, for instance, in reviewing the second of the three works before us (which relates the fall of Jerusalem), admits that M. de Champagny's "narrative is spirited, his learning considerable, and his description of the Roman Empire and its several Provinces generally faithful and picturesque." This is high praise to be given from that quarter to a work zealously Catholic. His "main blemishes," adds the Reviewer, are "credulity and ultrajudicial zeal," (i. e.) credulity as to the narrative of the martyrs, ultrajudicial zeal in tracing the judgments of God, not a mere political catastrophe, in the great tragedy of Jewish history. The Count, he complains, "is not content with descreying in events the swift or tardy justice of heaven. He traces it equally in their accessories and minor phenomena, and seats himself, like Minos and Rhadamanthus in Plato's Republic, before the folding doors of Orchus, sending nations, principalities, and powers to the right or left, according to his own notions of the fitness of things. But it would be hard to persuade us that, in the first century of the Christian era, even Jerusalem was more wicked than Rome. To be consistent, the Count should doom both, or show reason why the former was annihilated and the latter permitted to oppress the earth for full two centuries longer. Then, in our opinion, he ascribes too much influence to the early workings of the leaven of Christianity. He magnifies Nero's persecution, in which it is doubtful whether the victims were singled out as Christians, and not rather taken up at random as turbulent Jews, &c."

We have given this passage in full, from a desire to do justice to M. de Champagny quite as much as to his Reviewer, for we presume that when the *Saturday Review*, highly commending the literary and historical merits of a book, finds nothing more than these as its blemishes, most English Catholics, and a very large proportion of English Protestants, will come to the conclusion that it is well worth their careful study: for, in truth, the complaint comes to this, that, while viewing the Roman Empire with the eyes of an historian and a philosopher, the author views it pre-eminently with the instincts of a Christian and a Catholic. Upon this charge, we must own ourselves unable to give M. de Champagny a verdict of "not guilty." Still the passage itself is remarkable, as an indication of the state of opinion and feeling spreading in England. The Count judges the nations "according to his own notions of the fitness of things." The writer, in more than one part of the same article, makes a rather prominent pro-

fession of writing as a Christian. Yet so much is he accustomed to regard all religious doctrines as the notions of this or that individual, that it did not even cross his mind that the Count believes and professes to judge, not by his own notions, but a divinely revealed rule. And then he cannot understand the peculiar guilt of Jerusalem. Is it possible that he has never read or heard the history of the Passion; the cry of the mad populace, "His blood be upon us and upon our children;" or the prophecies of our Divine Lord, and his weeping over the city, while he foretold its desolation, expressly as the punishment of its rejection of Himself? We know not when we have met a more striking example of the pagan method of regarding and weighing the facts even of sacred history. Not that the writer means to be irreligious. Far from it. He even indulges in religious remarks himself. He says: "The catastrophe of the Hebrew nation must always be profoundly interesting to Christian readers, who in its fall behold the accomplishment of a train of prophecies, and in its errors an impressive lesson on pride, stubbornness, and bigotry." Only he has so much accustomed himself to consider belief and disbelief as a legitimate exercise of private judgment, and a thing which it would be bigotry to praise or condemn, that he cannot bring himself to believe, that the rejection of God made flesh, the clamorous cries for His crucifixion, and the denial of His authority, can really have brought down upon any people so terrible a judgment. After all, these Chief Priests and Pharisees, at whose awful wickedness in rejecting the Christ of God Christians in all ages have shuddered with horror, what were they (according to modern uncatholic notions) but "Reverend gentlemen of the Jewish persuasion," and what else was their obstinacy except adherence to the "religion by law established" in their country?

Of the three works before us, the first, "The Cæsars," begins with a rapid glance at the state of Rome and Italy, and their history during the period in which the old republic was breaking up (which the author fixes as commencing after the destruction of Carthage). In the second chapter he takes up the narrative from the birth of the great Dictator Julius, and carries it on to the death of Nero. This history occupies a little more than half the three volumes. It is followed by a "picture of the Roman world," which, to any thinking reader, will be by far the most interesting, as it certainly is the most original, part of the work. At the same time, some readers may consider it a blemish, in a work professedly a history, that it contains, perhaps, even more of reflections upon history, pictures of the times, &c., than of narrative. We do not accede

to this censure. It means, after all, little more than this,—that M. de Champagny sets before us, not merely the emperors, their families, and their courts, but especially the nations, tribes, and individuals over whom they ruled. He had in fact much more right than Mr. Merivale to have taken the title “The Romans under the Empire,” rather than “The Cæsars.” This is a great merit, the want of which our own age has especially blamed in the historians of past times. We complain that while they tell us in detail strange and grotesque stories of tyrants, some of which would almost seem to be more in their natural place in the “Thousand and One Nights” than in the annals of a great and grave people, they give us no means of judging what sort of lives were led by the mass of their subjects; how they spent their time, in what things they found their pleasure, to what businesses they devoted their energies, how they lived and how they died. These are the questions which M. de Champagny answers in the “picture,” which occupies nearly half his work on the Cæsars, and which is, in our judgment, by far the most interesting part of it, and we hardly know where we should point for one more interesting. At the same time, it is one of which it is not easy to give specimens, although we shall have to recur to many parts of it as we go on.

After “The Cæsars” came “Rome and Judæa.” This is a history of only six years. Its main interest, of course, is in the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish worship and polity. Combined with this, however, is the contemporary history of Rome, which contains the strange military revolutions which followed the death of Nero.

It was a remarkable coincidence that while the Roman armies were already gathering in fatal circle round Jerusalem, destined, against the will of their commanders, to fulfil to the letter the prediction of our Divine Lord, and to consume with fire the “holy and beautiful house” which was the glory of the Jewish nation, the only temple in the world without an idol, at that very moment the Capitol itself and the temple of Jupiter, which the Romans identified with the eternal majesty of Rome itself, should also have been consumed, in the short struggle between the supporters of Vitellius and Vespasian. It is impossible not to feel as if the Almighty Ruler of the world were teaching the nations, that the old dispensations were to be swept away, and all things were now to become new.

Then follows what strikes us as one of the most interesting parts of this history—the estimate of position of the Jewish



people in the Roman empire before the last fatal war. Even under the Republic, and still more under the Empire, they were the spoiled children of the Roman State. By Julius Cæsar they were exempted from tribute in every seventh year, in which, by the law of Moses, the land was not to be cultivated. This is specially interesting, because, so far as we are aware, there is no positive testimony in the Old Testament to the actual observance of this law. Gibbon sneers at it as impossible. We must suppose either that at the time of the great Dictator it was observed more or less generally, or that he had so much reverence for the law of Moses as to make so very striking a recognition of it, even on a point as to which it was in practice obsolete. In either case, the fact is most remarkable. It was, however, but one among many. Our author devotes a whole chapter ("Rome and Judea," vol. i. chap. iv.) to the condition of the Jewish people before the reign of Nero. The effect of the evidence which he collects from many very different quarters will, we think, surprise even those who were before acquainted with most of the detached facts. The numbers of the Jewish people had long increased far beyond the capacities of their own land, even in its then fruitful state, of which in its present barren condition we can form a very imperfect idea. Everywhere they were found, and everywhere they were wealthy and powerful. In Jerusalem itself the greatest respect was paid by their Roman masters to the national religion, the bond and pledge of their distinct nationality.

In all parts of the world the Roman legions bore before them images of the emperors, to which idolatrous honours were paid. The orderly and conservative spirit of Rome forbade that the universal custom should anywhere be dispensed with. But into Jerusalem, and Jerusalem alone, the legions were never permitted to enter without veiling them from the inhabitants of the holy city. Some pagans stealthily placed the image of Cæsar in a synagogue, and it was removed by Cæsar's representative. Inscriptions in Greek and Latin were placed at the entrance of the court of the temple reserved to the Israelites, denounced the penalty of death to any heathen who should trespass farther. The language of the two great conquering races, the language of empire, and the language of heathen philosophy, thus bowed down before the exclusive majesty of the Hebrew law. The Jews were even exempted from military service, that their scruples might not be offended by serving under the symbols of idolatry. The Roman State afforded its special protection to the transmission of gold from all parts of the Empire to the temple of Jerusalem. Even before the fall of the republic, a Roman magistrate in Asia had been impeached for having interfered with it. The irritable and proud conscience of the Jews obtained respect even for its scruples. Pilate once ventured to hang upon the walls of a palace some

golden bucklers consecrated to Tiberius, and marked simply with his name. The Jews complained to the Emperor himself of this flattery of the Emperor, and Pilate was reprimanded.

The toleration was carried even to worship. Pompeius in the giddiness of victory had ventured to enter the sanctuary. But the sight of that shrine without an idol had checked him in wonder and reverence. He had respected the temple, the city, the treasure, and had directed the priests to expiate the next day the profanation which he himself had thrown upon the sanctuary. And be it observed that Cicero, while pleading for Flaccus, although he attacks the Jews, because he was acting as the advocate of one of their enemies,—Cicero himself praises this moderation on the part of Pompeius. Others had been impressed with the same feeling of veneration. Hardly would a Roman in any official character so much as enter the court of the Temple, to which the Gentiles were admitted, without offering his adoration to the God of Israel. Agrippa, the minister of Augustus, while staying at Jerusalem, never let a day pass without visiting the Temple, and making costly offerings. Livia, the consort of Augustus, gave cups and vases of gold. Augustus himself, though he commanded the members of his family to abstain from personal worship, not only made similar offerings, but directed that a bull and two lambs should be offered daily at his cost and in his name to that unknown God of Jerusalem, with whose greatness he had been struck. This daily sacrifice, continued by his successors and celebrated by the Jews with pious zeal, was long the pledge of Roman toleration and of Jewish submission, the seal of friendship between Rome and Jerusalem.—(*Rome and Judæa*, vol. i. ch. iv.)

The very jokes of Horace and Cicero upon the Jews showed the reality and extent of their influence on Rome itself. In our own day, for instance, no man (even in Poland or Jamaica) would, even in satire, represent himself as refusing to enter upon a matter of business because it was the Jewish Sabbath. "The Jews," says our author, "caused the lamentations of the Hebrew Scriptures to resound around the funeral pile of Cæsar." Everywhere they enjoyed the rights of citizenship. St. Paul's possession of the citizenship of Tarsus and of Rome itself was no rare privilege. In most at least of the Greek cities, they enjoyed it before the Roman conquest; our author refers to authorities proving that this was the case at Alexandria, Antioch, Cæsarea, and other cities; he adds, "Pompeius, Cæsar, Antonius, Augustus, Agrippa, in gratitude for their enthusiasm, or their services, maintained their liberties, confirmed their exemption from military service, protected the transmission of gold to the Temple, and caused their privileges, which the Greek cities were always tempted to forget, to be inscribed in bronze." Claudius published a decree, giving them, in all the cities of the Empire, the same privileges which they enjoyed at Alexandria. Above all, they possessed

the same right of citizenship in Rome itself, and the number of Jewish citizens was so considerable that, by a special enactment, whenever the public distribution of corn (which formed so important a part of the privileges of the poorer citizens) took place upon the Sabbath, they were authorized to receive their share the day following. The fact is, that accustomed during many centuries to form a part of one or other great Empire, and placing their nationality in their religion rather than in their government, the Jews were perfectly prepared to yield a hearty support to the Roman conquerors, and wherever they were settled they came to be regarded, alike by the people and by the Romans themselves, as a sort of garrison for Rome.

To complete the resemblance between the people of Israel now and then, the Jews, in the first century as well as the nineteenth, were the men to turn their liberty to the greatest advantage. In our own day we see what that race has become, which has hardly been naturalized in the states of Christendom for sixty years, and the position they have made for themselves, not only in finance, but in politics, in science, in literature. The Jewish race is certainly one of those most richly gifted by God; for He has given it patience combined with boldness, ingenuity with energy, eloquence with finesse, sentiment with the pursuit of gain. It was then what it is now, only more entire and more near to the sources of inspiration. Then, as now, it knew how to use the liberties it had succeeded in obtaining.

In numbers the Jews were increasing, while the Greeks and Romans (by immorality and the exposure of infants) were rapidly declining in numbers. Our author quotes the express testimony of Tacitus, "They desire to increase their numbers. To kill any of their families is to them an abomination. They believe also that the souls of those killed in battle, or by the executioner, are eternal. Hence they desire to become fathers." The Jews in the Roman Empire our author calculates at eight or nine millions. What is more remarkable was the spread of their religion by proselytism. There was all over the earth a real famine of the knowledge of any true God. This knowledge the Jews had, and although there is no reason to suppose that the desire to propagate it was widely spread among them, they could not prevent the light from being more or less seen: "a city set upon a mountain cannot be hid." The "Acts of the Apostles" give us many indications of proselytes to the law. The kings and nobles of Adiabene (a heathen dynasty which reigned to the east of the Tigris under the protection of Parthia) were converted to the Jewish religion, it is said, by the teaching of a Hebrew merchant, retained it for several generations, and sent aid to the defence of the sacred city and the Temple against Titus.

At Damascus almost all the Tyrian women followed the law of Israel. Rome herself felt the attraction. Many men, many more women of Rome, converted in different degrees, some even so far as circumcision, observed either the fasts, the abstinences, or the Sabbaths. In Horace, Seneca, Perseus, Tacitus, and Juvenal, we find Rome teeming with these proselytes, the Sabbaths and fasts publicly observed, the feasts of the Jews known by everybody, lanterns lighted in the windows on the days of Jewish solemnities. Plutarch bears equally strong testimony to the notorious observance of the Jewish religion in the Greek cities. The description, "a proselyte," occurs in connection with the names of Roman women in the catacombs of the Jews at Rome. Dion, speaking of the Sabbath and the custom of dividing time by periods of seven days, adds:—"The ancient Greeks, so far as I am aware, knew nothing of this usage. In our day it is familiar to all men, and especially to the Romans, with whom it has become one of the customs of their country."

Our author concludes that the Jews, before the destruction of their city, were much in their present situation, with the addition of a religious earnestness and zeal which they have now quite lost.

But our conception of the position of the Jewish people would be very incomplete unless we bore in mind what Jerusalem was in itself, and especially what it was to them. It was on the 9th of April, A.D. 68, that Titus and his army came within sight of the city, and looked down on that glorious spectacle, by which, thirty years before, "the King of Israel, who came in the name of the Lord," had been moved to tears.

The country round Jerusalem had not then the aspect of desolation and barrenness which in our day goes to the heart of travellers, and has inspired so many beautiful and mournful words. Five consecutive centuries of habitation and cultivation had overcome the naturally rugged soil. The olive, the fig, the vine, were flourishing on every side. Water artificially distributed enriched a land naturally unproductive. Aqueducts and subterranean channels brought water to Jerusalem, which was never in want of it amid all the sufferings of the siege. In the midst of this rich landscape, across the precipitous ravine of Cedron, the eye rested on Jerusalem; and the city, which was called by Pliny the most illustrious of the whole East, appeared encircled by a range of towers, which being raised to a proportional height wherever the ground was lowest, appeared to be all on the same level, and encircled the city like a diadem.

But above this imposing crown of towers rose several pinnacles still more elevated. Sion, the city of David, which predominated over the whole city, dominated over in its turn by the three towers of Hippicos, Phasael, and Mariamme, each of which, massy and glittering, seemed as if carved out of a single block of white marble. Somewhat nearer, to the left, was the tower of Antonia, the guardian over the temple. Further back, beyond the rising ground of Bezetha, which concealed the lower part of it, appeared the higher

parts of the temple, white as snow, except where its whiteness was relieved by plates of gold, and lifting to the sky the thousand pinnacles which crowned its summit. The city of David and of Solomon was not then the needy and mournful place which recalls to the pilgrims the lamentations of Jeremias and the dolours of Calvary. It was a rich, strong, and powerful city. Agrippa had enlarged it almost by one half; every one of the Herods had laboured to ornament it. Pilate had built aqueducts for it. The Proselyte kings of Adiabene had palaces within its walls. The Cæsars had enriched it with gifts. At once wealthy and provident, encircled with towers and filled with palaces, its citadels were places of delight, its towers soaring two hundred feet in height (the battlements of which were soon to pour out the assailants' boiling oil) contained baths, reservoirs of water, banquet-halls, and lodging for hundreds of courtiers and slaves. The frame of mountains from among which it stood out set off the brilliancy of its white marble and gold. On the left, beyond the arid valley of the Cedron, rose the Mount of Olives, the dark foliage of which threw into relief the whiteness of the porticoes of the temple. In the background, the more distant mountains of Tekoa, abrupt, rocky grey, as travellers see them at this day—those, at least, are unchanged.”—(*Rome and Judæa*, vol. ii. c. xv.)

Elsewhere we hear that Jerusalem was considered to surpass Rome in beauty and riches as much as it was inferior in extent. Caligula was said to have had his imagination early turned to the East by the descriptions of Jerusalem which he heard from the captive chief Agrippa, in the days when the fate of both equally was trembling in the balance, in the palace of the jealous Tiberius. The wealth of the city was so great that the value of gold and silver in Syria is said to have fallen by one-half when its spoils were dispersed by the victorious soldiers of Titus.

Well might Titus desire to preserve from destruction so noble an ornament of the Roman Empire; but Jerusalem was doomed. Her outward beauties, rich as they were, were but the faint reflection of her true dignity, as “the city of the Great King.” This was lost on the day when her sons cried out, “We have no king but Cæsar!” henceforth, her outward beauty was like that which a corpse retains for a while, after the living spirit has departed from it, and now the time was come that even this should pass away.

M. de Champagny very strikingly traces the connection, as natural cause and effect, between the rejection of the true Christ and the utter destruction of the city, temple, and polity of the Jews. It is impossible to consider the amount of the prosperity of the Jews under the Empire and of the solid ends to which they turned it, without astonishment that a people so highly favoured by the rulers of the world, and turning their favour to such good account, should have broken out into a

hopeless rebellion, and persisted in it with an obstinacy which almost compelled the conqueror to push his victory to their utter destruction. It was the more marvellous, because (as we shall have another occasion to notice) at that very period, other provinces, even when less favoured and with much less to lose, clung to the Empire from a sense of the benefits it secured to them. It is impossible to doubt, that, but for their own utter madness, the Jews might have continued to enjoy, under the shadow of the Imperial rule, the high position which they had attained, and an ever-increasing prosperity. In one passage (if we are not mistaken) our author speaks as if there existed, even then, a dislike towards them greater perhaps than that of our own days. This we cannot imagine possible. That there would be a great jealousy of a people so separate from all others, so closely united among themselves, and exciting so much envy by their exceptional prosperity, cannot be doubted. An able writer says, "What is most hateful to a nation is another nation," and the more the maxim is weighed the more its truth will be felt. But to call out this hatred, the two nations must be in pretty close intercourse. This, we presume, has made France, in times past, "the natural enemy" of England. This assuredly it is which is always endangering the good-will which for a thousand reasons ought to exist between England and her own flesh and blood in the United States. The danger in this last case would be far less if the two had not a common language. But while circumstances have impressed and are daily more deeply impressing upon the people of the States a distinct national character, their use of our language enables them to read day by day, from one end of the Union to the other, English newspapers and reviews which bring home to their feelings our distinct nationality. It is obvious at the same time how entirely wanting on this side the Atlantic is the animosity which so often shows itself on the other side. Perhaps it would not be so if American newspapers were so widely read here as English papers are in America. But we must return to the Jews. There were causes in plenty to make them more or less unpopular in the provincial cities, especially in Egypt and the East. But this unpopularity could hardly have been so great as that of the haughty Roman conquerors themselves. And except under some strange combination of circumstances (such as the madness of the unhappy youth Caligula) the Jews were certain of Roman protection for their persons, property, and privileges. Their unpopularity itself, therefore, was but a pledge for their continued fidelity to the Empire. How came it that they suffered themselves to forfeit the protection and



to draw down upon themselves the full force of that arm irresistible by any earthly might?

The answer to this question our author gives in a most interesting chapter ("Rome and Judæa," vol. i. chap. v), in which he traces first the well-known expectation prevailing among all nations, alike of the East and West about the time of Augustus, that a great king and deliverer, a restorer of that golden age of which the poets had sung, was immediately about to appear. Moreover even among heathen nations, this general expectation was so specially connected with Jerusalem, that when Nero found Rome slipping out of his grasp he had been assured by his astrologers that he was destined to found a new empire at Jerusalem ("Cæsars," vol. ii. p. 233). Among the Jews alone this prophecy took a form distinct, definite, intelligible, for upon them alone the sun of divine prophecy had shone clearly out (like a gleam falling upon one spot of a clouded landscape), while the other nations only saw its obscure reflection. By them it was clearly understood that the times were fulfilled, the ages marked out by Daniel the Prophet had run their course, and the Prince of Peace was ready to be revealed, who was to unite all nations under his sceptre, but who was especially to be the King of Israel as well as the Son of David. The time came, universal peace was at length established, a deep silence of expectation reigned over the whole world. Bossuet sums up the history of Augustus: "Victorieux par mer et par terre, il ferme le Temple de Janus (A.O.C. 753). Tout l'univers vit en paix sous sa puissance, et Jésus-Christ vient au monde." "He came unto His own and His own received Him not." The "time of visitation" passed by unknown to them. According to the prophecy of Malachias, "The Lord whom they sought came suddenly to His temple" and they knew him not. He had come and gone, and they were still in expectation—an expectation which like a maddening thirst grew daily more and more intolerable. For a while, indeed, they persuaded themselves that they had mistaken some detail in their calculation of the times defined by Daniel the Prophet, and that the time instead of being gone by was immediately to come. It is touching to read how they were compelled to abandon, one after another, each of these hopes. At last they could no longer doubt that the time was come. In every whistle of the breeze, in every light upon the sky, in every rumour upon the earth, they listened for, they looked out for, they heard, they saw, the coming Messias.

Then were fulfilled the words spoken in sorrow, and yet in condemnation, by our Divine Lord: "I have come in the name

of My Father and they do not receive Me ; if another shall come in his own name, him they will receive." Then, according to His prophecy, arose false Christs and false prophets, saying, "I am He," and all the policy of the chiefs of the nation failed to prevail with the multitude not to go after them. The intense pain of long-protracted disappointment necessarily resulting from the wilful blindness which had failed to distinguish the true King of Israel when they saw Him, goaded them on to insurrection and destruction. Even when Jerusalem was already encompassed with armies, when the Christian remnant, recognising the signs given them by their Lord, had already fled to the mountains, and had found shelter under the protection of Agrippa at Pella, it was the certainty that, let the years of Daniel be interpreted as they might, the time for their fulfilment must have arrived, that impelled the Jewish people to reject all the offers of Titus and to risk upon a fortune, humanly speaking utterly desperate, not merely their lives and families, but what was to them dearer still, their holy city, the holy and beautiful house where their fathers had worshipped, and the polity of the once chosen people. Thus in God's righteous judgment did the very expectation of the Messiah become the sting which urged madly on to ruin the people and city which had refused to acknowledge Him when He came unto them.

It is impossible to resist the thoughts which crowd upon the mind in contemplating this appalling catastrophe. The whole history of the world, no doubt, is that of man neglecting or throwing away callings and opportunities given to him by God. But we can hardly err in saying, that no other instance of it has been so striking, so miserable. What was the part designed in the Divine purposes for Israel, if he had been true to his vocation? Already, in spite of all his failings and unfaithfulness, he was, in the midst of the heathen world, a chosen witness to the existence, the unity, and the attributes of God. Already his witness had been heard and weighed by thousands. If the Messiah had not been rejected; if even at the last moment, after the day of Pentecost, He had been acknowledged, not merely by the "remnant," but by the nation as a nation, the imagination strives in vain to paint to itself the blessings, both to Israel and to the world, which would have resulted. Here, surely, we may apply the words of S. Paul, "If the loss of them was the reconciliation of the world, what would the receiving of them have been but life from the dead?" What would it have been, if the synagogue in every city had been a pharos, "shining as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life," instead of the citadel,

held by its most obstinate enemies? And the same change would have averted the destruction of the city and nation. For the fanaticism which drew down upon them the avenging sword of Rome was excited, as we have seen, by the perpetually-disappointed expectation of the coming of the Messias. Nay, the causes of their unpopularity in the Empire would have been diminished almost indefinitely by the more amiable social qualities which their hearty acceptance of the true Christ would have developed; while the fatal influence of false Christs would have been wholly prevented. We venture to think that M. de Champagny has been led to exaggerate the measure of their disfavour with other populations, owing to his knowledge of the hatred which has been felt towards them in Christian nations. It is needless to say that although in the middle ages every circumstance which had made them unpopular in the Greek and Roman cities existed in full, and even in increased form; the feeling towards them was caused, not by this, but by the recollection of their great national crime, which each succeeding generation of Jews seemed to continue and make its own, by its continued rejection of the true Christ. It is impossible to estimate the spiritual and temporal grandeur of the position which the nation would have occupied, had she but known the day of her visitation.

Miserable, indeed, it is to turn our eyes from that which we cannot doubt was the gracious purpose of God, to the lot which she chose for herself. The events which led, step by step, to that awful catastrophe, are excellently described by M. de Champagny. How the multitudes of the nation were collected into the holy city. How all the desires even of the heathen conqueror to save it were frustrated by the obstinacy and fanaticism of the contending factions. How overwhelming was the destruction. How the remnant was condemned, as if in insult, to pay to the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter the very offering, the didrachma, which the Jews had been privileged to send from all quarters of the earth to the shrine of the true God at Jerusalem. How they were driven once and again into desperate attempts to rise. And how each effort only sunk them deeper. And then comes not merely the oppression of their enemies, but (as Moses had foretold) the last degradation of their own souls. Their temple and worship finally gone, the distinction of their priestly tribe forgotten, their religion had no longer either a reason for its existence, or a means to keep it alive. It was a dead tree. The people sank as much below the religious level of the nations among which they were dwelling, as their forefathers had been above that of the heathen nations. The twilight of Judaism had been a

bright light when surrounded by the dense darkness of paganism. In the clear shining of gospel light, it lay like a dark spot amid fresh snow.

But we must not longer dwell upon the two volumes ("Rome and Judæa") which give that thrilling episode of the history of the Roman Empire, the fall of Jerusalem. These are followed by three, on the "Antonines," in which, besides continuing the history of the Empire and the emperors for a further period of an hundred and eleven years, our author suggests numberless most interesting trains of thought, and especially that to which we referred at the opening of this article, the unseen and unrecognised influence of the Church upon the whole moral and social state of the world, even while the world was still heathen. It was especially to these three volumes, though by no means to the exclusion of the others, that a distinguished French writer referred when he wrote—"Le plus beau privilège des écrivains qui pensent, c'est de faire penser ceux qui les lisent. M. de Champagny fait penser."

Perhaps the most startling of his propositions is that more personal freedom was enjoyed by freemen under the Roman empire than under any modern [continental] government. Yet he proves it. He naturally thinks chiefly of France, but we believe the other continental nations are in the same condition.

We, the proud citizens of a parliamentary monarchy, who have made revolutions when we were called subjects—*subjects* we were, and still are at every turn of our lives. We were and are unable to go from Paris to Neuilly; or dine more than twenty together; or have in our portmanteau three copies of the same tract; or lend a book to a friend; or put a patch of mortar upon our own house if it stands in a street; or kill a partridge; or plant a tree near a road-side; or take coal out of our own land; or teach three or four children to read; or gather our neighbours for prayer; or have in our house an oratory [what is an oratory?]; or bleed a sick man; or sell him a medicine; or (in some countries) be married; or do any of a thousand other things which it would fill volumes to enumerate—without permission from the civil government. And this permission, we are carefully told, is always in its very nature subject to be recalled. Commonly, indeed, the government does not either authorize or forbid,—it tolerates. We live by toleration. Thanks to the merciful and indulgent toleration of the civil government, we are permitted (until we receive orders to the contrary) to be born, to have a home, a family, to bring up our children, to have a God, to have a religion. Only one event there is in human life over which the government has not authority. We die without requiring its permission, but we cannot be buried without it. At certain moments we are sovereign over certain great and public matters; but in small matters of private life we are subjects, and much less than subjects. Unluckily, these small matters

make up our lives; and these private matters are their most important events.

This passage describes, in very few words, the real difference between the English and Continental ideas of government. Every successive French government, old *régime*, republic, empire, monarchy of the Restoration, monarchy of July, second republic, second empire—all have been alike in this. What we mean by "personal liberty" has been unknown, and not even generally desired under any of them. This perpetual interference of the civil authority with every action of private life, is maintained, we believe, under all continental governments alike, chiefly because it increases the patronage of the government, by finding employment for thousands of petty functionaries. So far is this bad system carried, that, as a general rule, young men, instead of making a career for themselves, learn from their childhood to look to government patronage for their support and advancement. In England (as Mr. Göschen stated from the hustings at his late election) there is a perpetually increasing tendency, not on the part of government to interfere, but on the part of the people to call for its interference. Within reasonable limits, this cannot be avoided. In a highly complicated state of society like ours, it is no longer possible to maintain in all points the custom of our ancestors, who left everything to be done by unpaid local agents, selected by their neighbours. In London, for instance, we should be sorry to exchange the "Peelers" for the old-fashioned constables and watchmen. But it is essential that we should observe and guard against the inevitable tendency of advancing civilization to throw more and more power into the hands of the central government, and thus to substitute the perpetual interference of civil authorities for personal liberty and local self-government. To this gradual increase of administrative interference, M. de Champagny in a great degree attributes the decay of the Roman empire. In its earlier days, even under Caligula and Nero (however the nobles of the city might suffer under the tyranny of a mad man), the mass of the provincials and the humbler classes of freemen, even in Rome, were really free. And this liberty of the Empire, our author shows, was as important in preparing the way for the successful preaching of the Gospel as were the unity and universal peace, the effects of which have so often been traced. He says:—

A modern European, as soon as he leaves his home and begins to act, to think, or to live among his fellows, must assume that everything is for—

---

\* There are some omissions in this extract.

bidden which is not expressly authorized. Under the Roman empire all that was not expressly forbidden was understood to be authorized. Above all, the intellectual liberty was entire. Every one talked, listened, gave and received information publicly, and as he pleased. Doctrines spread; schools raised themselves without the interference of the secular power, until it felt itself in danger, not from the general independence of thought (that mis-giving had not yet been conceived) but from the special character of some teaching which arrested its attention. Even when the Imperial government resolved upon severity, its rigour might often be averted, sometimes even paralyzed, by the municipal authority, which alone was on the spot and in activity in the interior of each great city. Thus the Christian teachers and apologists presented themselves as "philosophers." For, as a general rule, philosophers were at liberty to teach what they pleased.

This was the natural result of a state of society in which the national religion taught nothing, true or false. When a system which really exercised authority over conscience came in conflict with it, then and not before, the civil government took the alarm, and hence Christianity alone came, after a time, to be excepted from the general liberty allowed to all philosophies.

But this liberty was a happy accident, arising from circumstances, not grounded on principles; and hence, as our author shows, it was gradually diminished as the administration of the Roman empire became more systematized, until, about a century after the Antonines, the prevalent system was that of "a semi-modern monarchy."

Nothing can more strongly confirm our author's opinion that the earlier Roman empire was "a federation of free nations under an absolute monarch," than the feeling with which, as a matter of fact, it was regarded by the conquered provinces. Gaul was conquered, after a desperate and heroic resistance, fifty years B.C. How soon afterwards it was left practically without a controlling Roman force we do not know. Before the death of Nero (A.D. 68) such had long been its natural condition. A small army on the north-eastern boundary repelled the wild and war-like German tribes; but even this was composed of natives. In the civil war which followed, the mass of this force marched into Italy with Vitellius. A few enterprising Gauls took the opportunity to restore the national independence. Even they, however, so far from proposing to abolish the Roman institutions, only wished to establish an independent empire; in fact, to make Gaul, not Italy, the seat of the Roman empire. Hence it seems to have been that, contrary to all precedent, the remainder of the legions was drawn into the scheme. For several months the whole province was literally without one Roman soldier. The provincials, left wholly to themselves,



held a meeting of delegates from all the Gallic nations at Treves, and after full discussion, determined (as it seems by an overwhelming majority) to continue subject to the Roman empire.

And this was a country of free and brave warriors, conquered for the first time not a hundred and twenty years before.

Ireland has now been subject to the kings of England for about 700 years. If any conjuncture should draw out of it every British soldier except a very few of Irish origin, and if these should all be drawn into a movement for the independence of Ireland, is it likely that the representatives of the whole nation, meeting freely, and after full discussion, would resolve by a large majority that things should remain as they are?

One would almost be tempted to doubt whether, in the art of government, England herself had not something to learn from Imperial Rome.

Our author is specially interested in tracing the gradual unobserved action of the Church upon the worst evil of Roman society,—its slave system. As a matter of fact, all through the period of which our author treats, the position of the slave was gradually being changed for the better. In theory Aristotle had pronounced slavery an institution both natural and necessary. Dion, a century after the Incarnation of our blessed Lord, declared it to be unlawful. In law, Augustus had confirmed to the master the power of life and death; Adrian deprived him of it, and Antoninus Pius went so far as to forbid by law even the ill-treatment of a slave. Marcus Aurelius even gave the slave in certain cases the right to demand his freedom.

Meanwhile the whole jurisprudence, contrary to the fundamental and universal law of slavery, inclined, timidly no doubt, to the acknowledgment of certain family ties between slaves. It did not absolutely forbid the separation of the wife from the husband, or of the children from their mother, for that would have been to overthrow the institution itself; but it allowed it with manifest reluctance and difficulty. Men's habits and feelings underwent a similar change. Cicero conceals, as an humiliating weakness, tears shed at the death of one of his slaves. Pliny the younger deems it an honour to have wept for his. He boasts that he considered them "his neighbours," and treated them as his children. As a last indication of the same feeling, monuments were commonly erected by masters, slaves, and freedmen, to each other, and the posthumous testimonies of their mutual affection are numerous among the inscriptions of tombs.

In this change our author traces the effect of the teaching

of the Church even upon those who did not enter her pale. The Church had treated the institution of slavery, as well as that of arbitrary power in the monarch, with all her own supernatural wisdom. She had not denounced institutions which she found in universal possession, and to demolish which would have been to undermine the fabric of existing society without substituting for it anything better. What she did was the very reverse. Leaving the old institutions of the heathen world to themselves, she set herself to teach to every one of her members first principles utterly inconsistent with them. She taught, for instance, to every one, rich or poor, bond or free, the equality of all men before God, and without altering the legal relation of master and slave, even among her own members, by any general enactment, she carried out into full action this principle of equality in all her own dealings with individuals of both classes.

In the bosom of the Church, this equality was at once realized. Christianity left to the "City of this world" the distinctions and relations upon which it depends. But the Church, the City of God, is independent of the city of this world, and orders matters without reference to the prejudices, perhaps unavoidable, upon which the human society is founded. Inside the Church, as in the sight of God, there is neither freeman nor slave, neither Greek nor barbarian; the Roman knight, with his gold ring and his white toga, cannot call upon the simple labourer in a tunic to make way for him. The senator, who is one of the ordinary faithful, will bow down before the slave\* who becomes a bishop. The Christian hierarchy does not proclaim war against the civil hierarchy, but is separate and distinct from it. In it the poor and the noble, the Roman matron and the female slave, kneel side by side, pray together, exchange the "kiss of peace," call each other "brother" and "sister," and, mingled upon a common level of blessedness and greatness by reason of the eminent dignity to which all of them alike are called, receive together the body and the blood of their God.

Then, just before they return to the life of the world, they are once more united by the "Agape." What the Agape must have been, and what must have been the importance of its bearing upon Christian equality, has not been observed as it deserves. We are no longer engaged in acts of religion,—it is an action of domestic life; it is the brotherly repast of a society like those which the Greek called "*Hetariæ*," and the Roman "*Confraternities*." Only the communities of the Greeks and Romans admitted, as a general rule, only persons of the same social condition. Here, on the contrary, in direct opposition to the usages of the ancient world, is a brotherly feast of free and slaves, men and women, workmen and senators. The master sits side by side with the slave, whom he bought in the market for sixteen pounds sterling—worse than that, side by side with the freedman whom he emancipated the

---

\* S. Callixtus, Pope, was a slave for some years after he reached manhood.

day before—worse than that, side by side with a poor “hand” who never had the honour to be connected with him either as freedman or as slave. It is the custom to exclude all women from solemn feasts; but at this not only women, but waiting-maids and sempstresses are admitted. To supply this feast, the bread eaten by the poor has been presented by the rich; but the gift would not have been received unless the rich had consented to eat it in common with the poor; if they had not added the alms of their society to the alms of their bread. We find from S. Paul, that reluctance was sometimes felt upon this point; that there was sometimes a desire to take the “Agape” apart; that some of the rich would have liked to have luxuries in a separate corner, and have left black bread in another corner to the poor. But of this S. Paul would not so much as hear. He maintained this singular institution of the “Agape” strictly on the principle of equality, community, and fraternity. Thus might be said of the “Agape” what was said of a feast of a widely different degree of holiness and majesty, “We are all one body, for we are all partakers of one bread.”

Year after year, throughout their whole lives, during several generations, did these practices form the habitual custom of many thousand Romans, men and women, among whom many were rich and noble, but many more were poor or slaves. It was not in the nature of things that, by degrees, some whisper of what was thus going on close to them, among their own neighbours, friends, and kindred, should not reach the ears even of the heathen. Even after the original security of the Church had been broken by the persecutions of Nero, she often enjoyed peace for many years together. During such times, and (we may be sure) still more when any new persecution was beginning after a long intermission, the peculiar doctrines and practices of the Christians must have been the talk of ten thousand assemblies and domestic circles. They must have attracted the same sort of attention which we know as a matter of fact had, long before, been given to the customs of the Jews. They must have been criticised, defended, laughed at, and praised by thousands. No doubt, the wildest accounts would be given of them (this we know, from the writings of the apologists, actually was the case), yet they could hardly be more misunderstood, or more misrepresented, than the doctrines and practices of Catholics have been in our memory; and, indeed, still are, in London at this day. Under these circumstances, it is hardly conceivable that the feelings and customs of Christians about slaves should not, more or less, become known in general society. Here, then, we have a cause strong enough gradually to affect the thoughts and conduct of others; for truth needs only to be set before men, and it will commend itself to them. Not that they always act upon it. That, unhappily, is too

often prevented by the corruption of their wills; but on the whole, they will approve it, and, when not under special temptation, they are likely by degrees to imitate, as far as they can without inconvenience, those who do act upon it. Just such was the imperfect imitation in the Roman empire of the Christian practice with regard to slaves. No other account which can be given in any degree explains the unquestionable fact of such a change for the better as actually took place. Here was a cause which we know to have been in operation. Its natural effect would be exactly what we know actually happened; under these circumstances, we do not see how anything except obstinate prejudice can make any man hesitate to believe that the silent influence of Christianity was the real cause of the improvement in the law and practice of slavery under the Antonines. It is what Bacon would call the test of the *vera causa*.

But there is an effect of slavery more fatal, perhaps, to a State than even its effect upon the master or upon the slave. This is its effect on the mass of those too poor to possess slaves. Wherever slaves are numerous, labour becomes a disgrace to freemen, however poor, as being the badge of a servile condition. This fatal social poison has worked alike in the ancient and the modern world—and not least at Rome. The agricultural labour which had once been the honourable employment of consuls and dictators, had now been turned over to “fettered limbs and branded faces.” This evil, however, the Church met as directly as the other. The easy manumission of slaves was part of the Roman system. The Church did not command it, but unquestionably, in practice, encouraged it. It is plain, therefore, that besides masters and slaves, it could not fail to contain a large multitude of poor freemen. M. de Champagny paints most powerfully how she would not only attract many already poor, but how the fact of conversion would make poor many who before their conversion were well provided for.—(*Antonins*, vol. ii. p. 156.) There were multitudes who had no alternative but either to labour hard for their daily bread, or else to obtain it by falling back into heathen rites or heathen morals. Something very similar is continually seen among ourselves, among converts of a class somewhat higher. At Rome, besides many slaves set free by Christian masters for the love of Christ, there were many free men and women escaped from the service of the temples, the circus or the theatre, the prætorium or the basilica, or from ways of life still more openly immoral. For the words of our blessed Lord to the proud Pharisees were fulfilled to the letter:

"The publicans and the harlots enter into the kingdom of God before you." All these had been arrested, instructed, regenerated; but they had still to be fed. And how could this be done? Only by their being taught to imitate Him who toiled for His daily bread in the workshop of S. Joseph at Nazareth. "The mass of the liberal professions were difficult, if not impossible, to a Christian." This our author shows at length. Either, then, they must be handicrafts; or they must be supported by the alms of the Church; or they must fall back into heathenism; or, finally, they must starve. It was under these circumstances that S. Paul laid down the rule that "if any man would not work, neither should he eat," and admonished those who desired to live in idleness, "to work quietly and eat their own bread."

Moreover, the labour of a Christian had a value, which heathen labour, even if it could be obtained, had not.

The one (says our author) was enervated by debauchery, the other purified by fasting and strengthened by continence. The one smarted under the contempt which, in heathen society, attached to manual labour. Under a sense of disgrace, by stealth, blushing at his disparagement of himself, he performed the servile work to which his poverty condemned him. The other knew, indeed, that it was as a penalty that he was condemned to labour; but it was a penalty imposed upon him in common with the whole human race; and he felt that the man who accepted this necessity bravely, humbly, cheerfully, found in it not shame but honour. Bishops, saints, martyrs, apostles—a God himself—had accompanied or gone before him in his toil. The one, by reason of the contempt which pressed upon him, found himself deprived of assistance, consolation, advice, credit; the other, free in the bosom of the Church from this contemptuous prejudice, and to whom the Church gave the rich, the learned, the senator, as his companions at table, his friends, his brethren: could talk with them, in the brotherly intercourse of the "Agape," over the necessities of his toil and the wants of his family; could take counsel from their superior education, be encouraged by their friendship, be even aided by their denarii. "From him that would borrow of thee," said the Gospel, "turn not thou away." Would it be possible to refuse a few denarii for the repair of a broken tool, or the purchase of the raw material of his manufacture, to the brother who had just shared with you the cup of the Agape, and to whom, in the Holy Mysteries, you had just given the kiss of peace? Capital and industry—the two grand personages of the modern social drama—the one with his toga, his gold ring, and his white hands, the other with simple tunic and horny hands, met and embraced, and dipped their hands into the same dish, in the Agape, and contracted an alliance such as the ancient world had never known. In one word, modern industry, with its thousand productive schemes for bringing together capital and industry, was all in its germ in the Agape, and in the workshop of the Christian (p. 139).

Our space forbids us to follow M. de Champagny farther, and trace the effects of Christianity upon a world which was not yet aware whence it had borrowed its new principles; as they showed themselves in private life, the relations of husband and wife, of father and children, and of rich and poor. That such an effect should have been produced was to be expected, for the moral and social principles which Christianity enunciates, high and holy as they are, are such as man's natural reason, if it would not have discovered them, heartily accepts and embraces when proposed to it. Passion too often carries him away in practice; but his "inward man delights in the law of God," and so would it surely be with the higher mysteries of the faith as soon as they are declared, if man's heart was not perverted.

And this leads us to believe that even in countries which have once been Catholic, and have unhappily forgotten their old faith, there will generally be left behind it a residue of moral and social principles which men would never have discovered for themselves, although, having once learnt them, they call them natural principles; as, indeed, they are in this important sense, that the natural conscience receives and bears witness to them. For instance, has the world ever seen a civilized country which was never Christian and was free from the institution of slavery? In our day it is denounced even by men who avowedly reject Christianity; but we believe that, had Christianity been unknown, the whole civilized world would now, as much as in the days of Aristotle, have agreed in considering it natural and indispensable. There are aspects in which this thought is encouraging. Christendom, or at least Christian nations, may sink deep, but, except in moments of frenzy (like that of Paris in 1793), they are hardly likely to sink so low as civilized nations before our blessed Lord came in the flesh. Individual Christians may, by rejecting greater light, be far more guilty than individual heathens; but nations can hardly again be covered by darkness so gross. This is in some degree a consolation under the miserable fact to which it is hardly possible for a thinking man to shut his eyes. Modern Europe has long been becoming, in many important particulars, more and more like the heathen Roman empire.

To revert to one point of this daily increasing resemblance. The time which has passed since standing armies were introduced into Christian Europe has been (compared with the life of nations) very short. In England, the system was quite in its infancy under William III., on the continent at the era of Charles V. and Francis I. The momentous political changes which it has already effected we have very briefly enumerated.



What more is it destined to work? At Rome the same system can hardly be said to have existed before the era of Sulla and Pompeius. In the next generation, it had swept away the ancient republic, and some generations later it established the principle that the government was to be administered, not by the Senate any more than by the populace, but by the creatures of the army. In France we can hardly wonder that the events which have marked the last few years have led thoughtful men especially to turn their eyes to the Roman Empire, and to consider how the evil of the military system of ancient Rome may be averted from modern Europe. This tendency has, no doubt, been greatly increased by the systematic repression of political opinion, which is the less excusable because it is combined with an extreme license in the avowal and diffusion of such as are only unbelieving and anti-Christian. Men who are not allowed to say what they think of France under Napoleon, will naturally try how far they can suggest it by speaking of Rome under the Cæsars. It is impossible, we think, to read the reviews and magazines published in France, and even many grave books on ancient history, without feeling that this necessity of saying in a parable what cannot be said openly has been a serious injury to history.

But even where this does not exist, it is evident and it is unavoidable, that the history of the ancient empire must have an interest for men of our generation which it had not for their grandfathers. While the ancient European dynasties were still ruling, more or less, on the ancient principles, the history of the fall of the Roman republic and of the early Cæsars seemed so strange to many men that they could hardly fancy the events to have happened in this same world of theirs and ours. In our day no man can write or even read the history of the Roman empire without being struck with parallels in the history of the European, and especially the French, revolutions. Thus M. de Champagny (who is, we think, quite free from the desire to make ancient history speak of modern politics whether it will or not) says the fall of Sejanus was but an anticipation of the 9th Thermidor. But the resemblance by which he is most painfully impressed, and which has struck thinking men of the most widely different views, is, that for many years past the public policy of all the European nations has fallen back upon heathen principles. If there are those who doubt this, it must be because they identify heathenism with idols, temples, and the like, which have little attraction for modern Europeans. But these things had already lost their power over men before heathen so-

ciety—"the City of the World," as S. Augustine calls it—had come to its height and perfection. M. de Champagny has a very interesting chapter, which he calls "One Word on Modern Paganism." He makes its essence to consist in the adoption of two principles, upon which he truly says,—

Roman antiquity founded its whole social system. [These are : first,] that the duty of man to the community of which he is a member, and especially towards the nation, is superior to all other duties ; and next (which is the converse of this) that the society to which a man belongs has an absolute right over him. [Upon this he remarks that] the Christian religion lays down exactly the opposite ; the great duty, the great foundation of the social order, is, not the love of an abstraction which is called our country, but the love of a real being, called our neighbour. Patriotism is not condemned but transformed by Christianity. It is one of the shades of this love. Christian patriotism is nothing more than a special love for certain men, in close relations with whom it has pleased God that we should dwell,—a law holy and venerable, but still a secondary law, a mere fragment of a superior law which includes it, and is supreme over it. The Country, in fact, under the Christian law, is no longer an abstract mysterious being, something superior to man and approaching Divinity, it is simply an aggregate of men, and as such subject to all the same obligations with the human being himself, to all the rules of justice and charity towards all men, whether citizens or foreigners, friends or enemies.

Hence (he adds) the Society has duties towards the foreigner, and no society, race, tribe, caste, or nation, may bear an exclusive love to itself, or seek its own welfare by means of the sufferings of others. National hatred, the oppression of one race by another, the spirit (I do not say of aristocracy, but) of caste, which leads one race to claim a radical superiority to another, these are things purely pagan and rejected by Christianity ; they transgress the great law of justice and charity, they break Christian unity, they spring from a forgetfulness of the double fraternity of man in Adam and in Christ.

In like manner, under the Christian law, the community has its duties towards each of its individual members as much as each member has duties to it. Under the Christian law no power is absolute, no authority is really without limits, because none dare overstep the boundary imposed upon it by the conscience enlightened by the faith ; and these bounds are much narrower than people fancy. Christianity accepts equally all forms of government, whether kingly or republican, aristocratic or popular ; whether limited by positive laws or only by the power of custom, by conditions made with men, or only by the duties imposed by the laws of God,—the power is still equally the ordinance of God, not in its form (which is a thing of human origin and variable) but in its essence, which is necessary to communities. Christianity, indifferent to political squabbles, which are often very vain and wretched, accepts all equally, and condemns nothing but despotism, if by despotism is meant, what ought to be meant, *power unconnected with duty*, an authority

which believes that it has all rights over men, even the rights refused it by the law of nature and by the revealed laws of God . . .

Thus have perished the two fundamental principles of heathen society,—nationalism abroad and despotism at home . . .

Modern paganism, in direct opposition to Christian faith, has moulded its politics like those of ancient paganism. The City it has made its temple. It once more deifies the public interests. Of the fiction called one's country it has made its God.

Next he goes on to show that all resistance to the Church (for instance in the eleventh, twelfth, and fourteenth centuries) has taken this form. The Protestant Reformation made gods of kings. Even in Catholic nations monarchs adopted a principle so flattering to them. Then came the great revolution. Its fundamental delusion was the same into which the kings of the eighteenth century had fallen,—that man's highest duty is to the community, and that the nation has no duties either towards its own members or its subjects. In a word, it was the rejection of the authority of God and of his Church. The fullest display of this principle was in 1793; but 1793 has passed away, and we still maintain the same principles. He concludes :—

It seems to me that we are living in the times of Augustus. We are coming out of a revolutionary crisis, as the Romans were then coming out of the crisis of the civil wars . . . But Augustus, without either knowing or desiring it, was preparing Tiberius.

Moreover, the tyranny of the Cæsars had one special characteristic, in which every modern tyranny, whether it will or no, is forced to resemble it. It was brought into collision with a power with which no former tyranny had had to do,—the power of conscience, the principle openly avowed in direct opposition to its unlimited claims,—“We ought to obey God rather than you.”

We have analyzed the more carefully this remarkable chapter\* (which we ought to mention ends with a strong expression of the author's hopes, in spite of all threatening appearances), because, on the one hand, we consider the general truth and importance of its argument unquestionable; and yet we feel, on the other hand, that there are in our own country some distinctions, the neglect of which might lead superficial observers to doubt or deny it. Wherever a “strong government” is the taste and custom of the nation (as it is eminently in France), the rejection of the authority of the Church leaves the national government unlimited and irresponsible. It takes away at a

---

\* *Les Césars*, vol. iii. p. 385.

stroke the only authority to which kings or rulers were before amenable. This is clear. In England, in our own day, it is, we need hardly say, by no means the national habit to assume that anything is right because it is done by the English government. It would, therefore, seem absurd to say that by taking away the control of the Church we have put the English government in the place of God. When the change of religion first took place, such was notoriously the case, and Wolsey, after his fall, while surrendering into the hands of the tyrant all he had, had but too much reason to beseech him to remember "that there is both a heaven and a hell." Perhaps his conscience told him that he had neglected to impress the lesson, as he ought, in the time of his court favour. Unhappily for Henry VIII. he had those around him whose interest it was to make him forget it, or at least to persuade him that kings need think nothing about hell. But worship of the monarch, like that of Cranmer, did not suit the national taste, and circumstances have long since abolished it. Still, although the idol has been changed, the idolatry continues. It is evident that the will of the nation and the nation itself, much more than the national government, is the especial idol of Englishmen. And yet even this seems to us less characteristic of England than of some other nations. For instance, every Frenchman is at once set on fire when he hears the very words "the glory of France;" but we much doubt whether speeches about the "glory of England," continued for a year together, would reconcile any considerable number of Englishmen to a penny additional on the income-tax. The annexation of a new province to France by any means, however dishonourable, throws almost every Frenchman of every class and every party into a thrill of ecstasy which an Englishman is incapable of feeling about any public event. No less a man than De Tocqueville (unless we are mistaken) deliberately declared that he believed the annexation of Belgium would be most unjust; but that if Napoleon III. should commit that injustice, he would acquire such a claim to the gratitude of every Frenchman, that he for one would never afterwards oppose his dynasty. We believe the feeling is universal among Frenchmen, with the exception of a handful of men whose love even to France is overpowered by their love of the liberty of the Church, to which they believe that the annexation of Belgium would be a serious blow. All honour to men who, though French, yet care more for the glory of God than even for what is called "the glory of France." All honour also to M. de Champagny, who has ventured so boldly

to assail the spirit of pagan patriotism, which is the idol of his country.

In England, unless we deceive ourselves, not only is the national government more the servant of the nation than its idol (and the Englishman is willing enough to "wallop his own nigger"); but the worship of the *patrie* itself is much less general and enthusiastic than it is in France. No one feels even the will of the nation to be his highest law. Very few would feel any scruple about breaking a law when it can be done safely. Perhaps no one would scruple to abandon his nationality altogether, and become a citizen of some foreign state, however the step might be forbidden by law and by the national feeling—if it suited his own interests.

And yet heathen principles of government are at least as strong in England as in France. Individuals, no doubt, there are, in some numbers (even out of the Church), who sincerely endeavour to regulate their own conduct by the rules and motives laid down by the Christian religion, as they understand them. But no one, we presume, would say that any attempt is made to refer to or recognize those rules in the management of public affairs; very few, probably, would think it either desirable or possible to do so. Let us illustrate our meaning by an example. Mr. Gladstone is notoriously a most sincere believer in the Christian religion as understood by High Anglicans. He firmly believes, therefore, not only that all men share one common nature, but also that that nature has been assumed, once and for ever, by the Eternal Son of God, Who, in it, has sat down on the right hand of the Father. And yet, it is certain that, if in a debate (say on the late Jamaica affair), Mr. Gladstone were to open or wind up his speech by laying down that stupendous fact as the basis of all he said, he would most materially injure, perhaps destroy, the eminent political station which he has earned by his unrivalled powers and high character. His speech would be universally pronounced either a sign of temporary insanity or (worse still) of the most wretched taste and fanaticism. Now, this is the more remarkable, because no one (not even an infidel) will deny, that the awful fact has the most direct and important bearing upon the subject; for the duties of a Christian to men of widely different races immediately result from it. It may be said that such a speech would be out of place, because there are Jews in the House of Commons. But, however plausible an explanation, that is certainly not the real reason of the feeling, because it would have been

quite as strong before the first Jew was admitted. The simple truth is, that in England all religious doctrines are recognized as "open questions," upon which each individual has a right to his own opinions, and as to which no one has any right to assume that his own convictions, however strong, are unquestionably true. What makes this plain is that there are other principles which any man may, without offence, take for granted, although they are not universally held; because they are admitted by the nearly universal consent of the English people. For instance, there may be in the House of Commons some two or three men who prefer a republican to monarchical form of government; yet no man would be blamed who publicly grounded his vote upon any question, upon his conviction that an opposite course would be inconsistent with monarchy. For (while individuals are free to hold the opposite opinion) the maintenance of the monarchy is one of the things which the mass of the nation considers necessary and fundamental. Again, we all know that to assume in the same manner the truth of the great Christian doctrines would formerly have seemed quite natural. Under Henry V., for instance, or Edward III., fine specimens of English character, such a thing would surprise no one, whether in a speech, an act of Parliament, or any other public paper.\*

---

\* Since this was written we have quite accidentally fallen in with an instance which illustrates our position. It is a pardon (in Rymer) to four men condemned for high treason. The preamble is as follows:—

*Reducentes in memoriam qualiter supremus Judex (cujus verba taliter testificatur Scriptura Sacra Mihi Vindictam et ego retribuam) nonnullas Personas nobis infideles tetigit et percussit anno ultimatum elapso.*

*Qualiter etiam Sacrosancto Die Veneris, qui jam instat, Salvator Noster Jesus Christus gloriosam Passionem suam usque ad Mortem pro salute nostra pertulit et sustinuit.*

*Et qualiter a Cunabulis nostris, singularem et internam Devotionem ad Beatissimam, gloriosissimam et intemeratam Virginem Mariam Dei Genetricem hucusque gessimus et habuimus et ad præsens gerimus et habemus, de cujus Assumptione magna et solemnis Festivitas in universali Sacrosanctâ Ecclesiâ Catholicâ, præsertim et præcipue et singulari devotione recommendanda in Devotissimo Regali nostro Collegio Beatæ Mariæ de Eton juxta Wyndesoram infra breve celebrabitur.*

He adds, especially, that Eugenius IV. and Nicholas, the reigning Pope, had granted the college great indulgences, and then continues,—"*Considerantesque nedum præmissa, verum etiam multimodas alias gratias Nobis per Altissimum anno ultimatum elapso exhibitas et ostentas.*" Sharon Turner, we find, mentions the Feast of the Assumption, the Friday, the text of Scripture, and the "multimodas gratias," as "four strange reasons." He does not allude to the other reasons, we shrewdly suspect, because he could make neither head nor tail of them. For what had indulgences to do with a pardon? Our point, however, is that no one at the time would think these "strange reasons."



It is plain, then, that the principle upon which public affairs are now regulated is this,—That we may assume that Christianity is true, but that no man has a right to assume that any one particular doctrine or fact is a necessary part of Christianity, that being merely a matter of private opinion. He may profess to support the Established Church, because that is a political institution, but still he must not allege, as the ground of his support, that its doctrines are true; for who can say (the nation feels) whether they are or not,—it is a matter of opinion.

And yet, some fundamental principle there must be, which English statesmen are obliged to respect. If it is not any one Christian doctrine or rule, nor yet the will of the government or even of the nation, what is it? We should be inclined to answer in one word,—that it is “Civilization.” No public man among us must act, except on “principles becoming a civilized nation.” Civilization is here taken in its ordinary sense. There are some, indeed, who say that it implies the highest Christian principles. Such is not the sense in which the word is commonly used. For instance, no man would say that the Romans under Augustus, or the Athenians under Pericles, were uncivilized. What the word really expresses is the whole of that collection of qualities, moral, social, intellectual, &c., which result from an habitual life in a civil community, and which qualify men for such a life. It does, therefore, imply many qualities which Christianity immediately tends to produce,—justice, mercy, courtesy, habitual consideration for the wishes and feelings of others, &c. But these qualities (although they can hardly be formed in their perfection except by Christianity) may in a great degree be produced, and still more may be admirably simulated, by the habits and intercourse of civil life. But civilization implies many other things which Christianity, at the utmost, only indirectly tends to produce. Such, for instance, as financial, political, and social science; the improvement both of the fine and, much more, of the mechanical arts; and the subjection of the material world, animals, vegetables, metals, &c., to the service of man. Although, therefore, the perfection of civilization, more or less implies the presence of some very high qualities, which can only be matured by Christianity, yet (inasmuch as the effects which these qualities produce upon society may, in a great measure, be obtained by other means—namely, by the training to be derived from civil and political life), and as many other things enter into the idea of civilization with which neither Christianity nor

moral perfection has any immediate connection, we cannot deny that civilization, in a very real sense, may exist without Christianity; nay, more, that a heathen community may, accidentally, be more civilized than some Christian communities. Indeed, it will hardly be doubted that one of the most important steps in civilization is the separation of military from civil life and duties. The English people, for instance, are at this moment better qualified for civil life than they would be if every man among us were at all times liable to be called upon for military service, and if no man (except a priest) could by possibility attain any high position in the State or the Law without actually spending a large portion of his life in warfare. Mr. Gladstone, for instance, or Sir Roundell Palmer, could hardly discharge the duties of their offices as they do, if they were obliged, as a matter of course, to lead in person some military expedition or other every summer, and to spend most part of it in the camp. Yet, this has generally been the condition of public men in Christian nations; while there have been heathen countries entirely exempt from it.

We may conclude, then, that civilization in its true sense, and much more as it is and will always be understood by the majority of men, does not necessarily imply either Christianity or even the highest moral qualities, and that it gives a proportionable importance to intellectual cultivation, and still more to the studies and arts which minister to material prosperity, which is quite inconsistent with the first principles of Christianity.

And if so, then a nation which makes civilization, and not revealed religion, its practical rule in the administration of public affairs,—in fact, makes material prosperity the chief good, and by so doing, really and truly, so far, falls back into heathenism. We cannot imagine that any thinking man can deny this; or, again, that he can doubt that the public affairs of our own country are thus administered. One night's attendance upon the House of Commons, or the study of one number of the *Times*, would surely convince him.

But we must go much farther than this. It is plain that thinking men, who themselves accept, without scruple or hesitation, what we have called the principles of modern heathenism, as the only right and safe principles, are forcibly struck by the fact, that (however true they may be) they are in sharp contrast and opposition to the fundamental principles of Christianity.

In proof of this consciousness we would refer to the *Saturday Review*. There is, perhaps, no journal which so accurately and fairly represents the political, social, and moral standard of educated Englishmen in our own day. It is written with singular ability and moderation, and (appearing weekly) it is free from the necessity of hasty writing, which is a condition of daily newspapers. Moreover, it would be quite unfair to call it an anti-religious paper.

A few months ago appeared an article on "The Dead Virtues." It mentioned especially purity, poverty, and (if we remember right) humility. It showed at some length that they have no place in the modern system of modern Englishmen; nay, that poverty especially is admitted to be an impediment to religious improvement, and it contrasted with these facts the well-known texts of the New Testament on the subject. The writer did not attempt to reconcile or remove the contradiction, but merely thought it worth noticing as a fact.

In a remarkable article on the late Lord Elgin a parallel was drawn between him and Agricola. It was suggested that the greater fame of Agricola has come in great degree from the accident of his having Tacitus for his biographer; and the author went on to say (as a general remark) that he had been much struck by the remarkable resemblance of the great English governors in India and elsewhere to the great heathen statesmen and administrators.

Nearly at the same time there was an article on the resemblance of the Sadducees among the Jews to educated Englishmen, and (if we remember right, it was said in so many words) to *Saturday Reviewers*. This bears closely upon our argument, because the Sadducees were clearly the heathenizing party among the Jews. The writer pleaded that our Divine Lord, although stating that the Sadducees had "erred," reserved for the Pharisees all His most severe censures. This seems in fact to have been because the special objects of His preaching were those "who sat in Moses' seat," i.e. the religious leaders of the Jewish people. The Sadducees were rather a heathen than a Jewish school.

In commenting upon the funeral sermon of the Dean of Westminster upon Lord Palmerston, whom the same paper especially commended as being strictly and eminently the English statesman, and therefore especially qualified for the place he had occupied, it went on to admit the difficulty of Dean Stanley's task, on the ground that it was "not easy in any way to make of Lord Palmerston exactly a *Christian hero*."

Lastly, a few weeks back there was an able article on the government of the coloured races in our colonial and foreign dominions. It was occasioned by the Jamaica affair, and laid down as a principle, that if we are to retain India or to keep the peace in colonies where the negroes are numerous, we must act upon principles precisely opposite to those laid down in the Gospels.

We might greatly have strengthened our argument, had space allowed, by quoting the *ipsissima verba* of these articles, and we doubt not we could with a very little trouble have found many more, bearing perhaps even more directly upon the subject. Those we have enumerated have all appeared in the last few months, and are such as we happen to remember without having the paper at hand. They are enough to prove our position, that thoughtful men, writing in the spirit of the day, are struck with the opposition between their own principles and those of the Gospel. We can but repeat M. de Champagny's account of the matter. The principles of heathenism are merely those of nature. When the supernatural is displaced, they resume possession of themselves. The misery of the heathen world (besides the lack of Christian graces) was that it was without fixed principles, without unquestionable facts, with regard to the moral and religious world. There, all was uncertainty and dispute, while material objects (let philosophers reason how they would) were ever close about men and pressing to obtain full dominion. With the mass of men, certain and pressing things carry the day against those which are unseen and only conjectural.

In those which we call the "dark ages," faith made the unseen world to the mass of the European nations more near and pressing, as well as greater, than the world seen. Men were under strong temptations. Except ecclesiastics, every man had always a sword in his hand. Civilization was far less general than it is now; for men always accustomed to decide everything by violence were disqualified for civil society. But even in the most unlikely men, and in those whose actions are least pleasant to contemplate, we find, all of a sudden, the strongest sense of the unseen and supernatural, not as a mere acknowledgment, but working out of their minds against their own wish. The great rebellion of the 16th century against the principle of faith has left the mass of men with nothing certain except objects of sense, and no rule except human civilization and material advancement.

So much has this uncertainty got possession of them, that they are unable so much as to understand the posture of mind

of those who retain the old faith. We were reading a few days ago a criticism upon the lecture delivered by our late Cardinal-Archbishop before the Academia of the Catholic religion, in which he considered the objections to the genuineness of the robe of the Blessed Virgin at Chartres, and to the account of the martyrdom of S. Ursula and her companions at Cologne. The critic complained that the Cardinal was wholly incapable of seeing what evidence is. This seemed odd; but it appeared that he supposed the Cardinal to have undertaken to prove, for instance, that the robe attributed to our Blessed Lady was really hers; as he would prove a murder against a prisoner. He did not see that the argument was not addressed to this point at all; that it was merely intended to prove that the common objections to the genuineness of the relic were without force. The fact was, the two minds approached the subject from opposite sides. The Cardinal began by assuming that an object was likely really to be what it was attested to be by an unbroken tradition of more than a thousand years. All he wished to show was that, when examined by unbelievers, it turned out to be exactly what it certainly would be supposing it to be genuine. The critic assumed that the tradition was false. He demanded, therefore, how do you prove the genuineness of the relic? and, of course, was disappointed when the Cardinal did not do what he had never thought of doing. This was no matter of faith; yet it illustrates our meaning, for it is clear that the mass of educated men in our day approach the supernatural objects of faith in the same spirit. They come with minds emptied of the tradition of eighteen hundred years, and demand proof of every detail. The appropriate proofs are not wanting: but, meanwhile, they are, like Agricola with Britain to conquer and pacify, too busy to examine the proofs of things, which it is the happiness of Christians to have learned as first principles at their mother's knee.

And hence the peculiar interest of the Romans under the Empire in our day. What may be coming we know not. We are struck with some great points of resemblance between two eras. But we know that the past never exactly reproduces itself;—much more, that the world is not governed by any iron law of necessity; so that, even if things were at the worst, it is left to our own labours and prayers to avert the catastrophe which once before fell upon it. The great lesson of the work before us is well stated by a French critic (M. de Meaux, in the *Correspondant*):—"It is useless to ask of history how far man's reason can go by its unassisted powers. What history proves is that this reason never does find its way so absolutely without a higher light. The primi-

tive revelation and the Christian revelation have been successively given to it by its Creator to complete it by surpassing it. Between these two revelations I seem to see heathen antiquity finding its way through a long and dark subterranean passage, both ends of which open into the light of day and the sunshine. At the point where the light which illuminated the entrance of the cavern loses itself in thick darkness, the stronger and fuller light, which blazes at its outlet, begins to penetrate. This is the point which Roman society had reached at the period before us. Let it press towards the light of the new rays which invite it onward. Let it take a new life, and not sink fatigued. Above all, let it not conceive a fatal love for the thick darkness to which its eyes have become habituated; and before long it will see the sky over its head, and will breathe the free and pure air."

How rash it would be to reason confidently from the points of resemblance to any similar result of these two great civilizations of the world, will appear, if we consider for a moment their most striking differences.

The basis of Roman society was slavery. The peculiar form of that slavery was, that the slaves were, in the main, of the same races, or at least of races nearly allied to that of their masters. The civilized world at present knows nothing at all analogous to this. So far as we know, the only civilized nation which, in this respect, at all resembled modern Europe, was Judæa; in which, so far as we can trace, slavery, though not strictly unknown, was within exceedingly narrow bounds. It is striking how little trace we find of the institution in the Gospels; and M. de Champagny remarks that Josephus never so much as alludes to it in his history. Elsewhere, it was the very foundation of the social system. Modern authors have been much in the habit of comparing the neglected labouring classes to the slave-class of antiquity. This has sometimes had too much foundation. But the change which emigration to the new world has already wrought, and which it is likely to carry to a degree of which we are wholly unable to forecast the limits and the result, entirely overthrows any such calculations. Above all, the Catholic Church is in possession of the modern world to a degree which the ancient world never knew. All appearances seem to show that the present is one of the critical periods of history, when what is old is falling away of itself, rather than being swept away. Our work is to see that we are not wanting to our children, that we leave to them, unbroken, the inheritance of truth. They in their turn will be called to struggle and contend for them. In the



world, as God has allowed it to be, there is no time for any generation to imagine that it has as yet entered into rest.

---

## ART. VII.—SIGNS OF AN IRISH POLICY.

*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.* Part I. Session 1866.

A YEAR has elapsed since, in an article entitled "Wanted a Policy for Ireland," we wrote the following words:—

But candid and honest Englishmen constantly ask, What does Ireland really want? Ireland wants, on the part of British statesmen, a policy; and still more, on the part of the British Parliament, good will to assist and give efficacy to that policy. But "what one nation hates most," said Napoleon, "is another nation." The British Parliament—a concentrated essence of all the passions and prejudices, as well as of all the abilities and virtues, of the English nation—in dealing with the affairs of Ireland, neither considers them as if Ireland were really and truly a part of the United Kingdom, nor yet as if Ireland were a peculiar province, requiring special and exceptional consideration. The animus of Parliament (of the majority of Parliament, taking both Houses together, we mean, of course), in considering the affairs of Ireland, is even still, three generations after the Union, that of one nation dealing with another nation—dealing with it not, perhaps, exactly as an enemy, but as an obstacle, a nuisance, a reproach, a cause of continual, incomprehensible annoyance and occasional serious danger, an opposite "moral essence" from itself, with different interests and habits, which it is impossible to gratify, and not even easy to apprehend. It was said, during a late debate, that if Ireland could only be towed round from the west to the east of England, and placed close to the coast of France, Parliament would soon see the necessity of settling certain Irish questions which it now contemptuously shelves from session to session. If Ireland, on the other hand, could only be towed half-way across the Atlantic, she would be sure of still greater consideration; for she would then be regarded as a colony occupying one of the most important positions in the globe, and would have the best constitution the Colonial Office could give her. Such hypothetical considerations as these, the force of which is simply obvious, are the worst reproach of the actual system of the British Parliament. That system allows the Irish nation to feel that Parliament will only act, where Irish interests are concerned, under the influence of alarm; and it is no exaggeration to say that this is a universal feeling throughout Ireland. It is not without reason. Take the few leading events in the recent Parliamentary history of Ireland. Parliament was induced to pass Catholic Emancipation only because the Duke of Wellington said there was no other alternative to civil war. When Sir Robert Peel wanted to increase the Maynooth grant by a few thousand

pounds, his principal plea to the House of Commons was that there was "a cloud in the west," a danger of war with America, in consequence of the Oregon question. Thus every act of justice that is done to Ireland is done, not as it ought to be done for justice' sake and on the merits, but as a concession and an act of propitiation to the natural ally of the enemy. We fear we are approaching a period of such ignominious arguments again.

Our augury, it would seem, was not far wrong. These words were uttered in the time, from which already a whole age seems to separate us, when Lord Palmerston swayed the state, and when his policy for Ireland was impersonated by Lord Carlisle, who, happily ignorant that such a disease as the rinderpest existed, was intent on the complete conversion of Ireland into a land of herds and flocks; and by Sir Robert Peel, who, incredulous of the very existence of Fenianism, was cultivating a close alliance with the Ulster Orangemen. It seems almost incredible that so few months should have elapsed since the Ministers of the Crown were assuring Parliament that Ireland never was more loyal and contented, and that the emigration to America was only the natural effort of industrious men desirous of bettering their condition—since it was confidently asserted that the Irish people had no remediable grievances, and, in particular, that it was a point of honour with the Ministry to maintain the Church establishment, and to refuse any further concession on the question of tenant right. Such was the language of the Ministry of Lord Palmerston to the end of last session. As we ventured to say at the time, nothing could be more offensive or more stupid than the conduct of Mr. Cardwell and Sir Robert Peel, the then Chief Secretary, and his predecessor, representing the Government in the Committee which inquired into the tenure and improvement of land in Ireland. But the Castle was no wiser than Downing Street. At the same time, so ill-informed was the Lord Lieutenant and the resident executive as to the state of the country, that in the month of September, after warmly congratulating the county of Tipperary on the peace and order which prevailed within its precinct, his Excellency revoked the Proclamation, which had for years forbidden to its inhabitants the possession of arms without the license of the police.

Meantime a conspiracy, which hitherto, thank God, has produced no serious results beyond a degree of alarm in England, like that which followed the outbreak of the Sepoy mutiny, was spreading its ramifications from end to end of Ireland. In the course of a day, the Government which had imagined it was sailing on "the smooth surface of a summer sea," was obliged to act as if a cyclone were about to burst from all

the points of the compass at once. Numerous arrests were made with extraordinary precautions, and under the cover of a heavy armed force. A newspaper was arbitrarily suppressed without warrant of law, and in a way without precedent in these kingdoms. The Channel Fleet was ordered to the west coast of Ireland. The garrison of Dublin was greatly strengthened and kept under arms night and day. A special commission was held, and a number of persons convicted of treason-felony, and sentenced to long periods of penal servitude. At last the Habeas Corpus Act is suspended; several hundred persons are arrested. The capital, the principal ports, and two-thirds of the counties are proclaimed. Still the conspiracy makes no overt attempt, and still the alarm of the Government does not abate. Indeed, the latest acts of the Lord Lieutenant show a deeper sense of the danger of the movement than was pleaded to justify the *coup de main* of last October. The special commission has been succeeded by a series of courts-martial on Fenian soldiers. Two of the most distinguished regiments of the line have, within a single week, been summarily transported to Malta, and the reason is no mystery. Notice has been given that the Irish Militia will not be called out for exercise this year; and the garrisons and police stations all over the country have orders not to relax their vigilance, but to observe the same discipline as if a rising were expected from day to day. Meantime, Mr. James Stephens, the "Central Executive of the Irish Republic," who walked out of Richmond Prison three months ago, without the least difficulty, and has since remained at large, with a reward of £2,000 on his head, is reported to have arrived in France, either with a view of conferring with Mr. John Mitchel, the Fenian envoy there, or *en route* for the head-quarters of the Brotherhood in the United States. On that side of the Atlantic, the signs are not less ominous. The Canadian Government, expecting their frontier to be invaded by the Fenian General Sweeny, are suspending the Habeas Corpus Act, and have called out the Militia of the Province. Though the Brotherhood is divided by a great schism, each of its sections appears to be strong in numbers, arms, and funds. At the congress, which took place at Pittsburg last month, there were many subscriptions of 5,000 dollars; many of 2,000, 1,000, 500; and a host of 100, and 50, and 20. An Irish merchant of New York offered a large steamer fully equipped; and another of Chicago, a gunboat, ready for service on the lakes. This, too, it may be observed, is only the Secessionist Roberts-Sweeny section of the Confederacy, which both the Head-Centre, Colonel O'Mahony, and the Central Executive

Stephens refuse to recognize. The resources of the New York Branch are even greater. At the time that the secession took place, it was estimated that O'Mahony had at his disposal, for Fenian purposes, a sum of not less than a quarter of a million sterling. No insurrectionary movement of our time, not even the Italian or the Polish, has had such advantages in its base of operations, in the sympathies of the people among whom it is situate, in its resources of money, and in the general fidelity of its agents. Italian agents, like Mazzini and Orsini, have found secure quarters and considerable resources in England, but nothing like the same wealth of means and general public acceptance as the Fenians enjoy in the United States. It is probable that we are now only at the beginning of their operations, and that it is only some ten years hence that they will begin to become really formidable. But abhorring as we do their principles, aims, and ends, we most reluctantly admit that we believe it has been the chief cause of compelling Parliament and the Cabinet to give, under the influence of alarm, that consideration to the affairs of Ireland, which, during the last ten years of torpid politics, has been systematically refused.

Now, side by side with the vigorous vindication of the law, we see the signs and promises of a comprehensive Irish policy seriously indicated. The debates on the state of Ireland in both Houses have, on the whole, a claim to the respect and gratitude of the people of that country. There was, perhaps, a too habitual tone in them of Parliament's ignoring its own responsibility for the existing condition of feeling in Ireland. This was most marked, for example, in the very eloquent, and very clever, but very fallacious speech of Lord Dufferin. His Lordship urged that the Fenians did not wish to see the Church establishment overthrown, or tenant right conceded; and implied that it was vain to make concessions upon these questions in the hope of arresting the spread of disaffection. But it must be realized by Parliament, if legislation is to do any good, that the reason why disaffection is formidable, or even possible, in Ireland, is, because Parliament has for a number of years neglected its duty in dealing boldly and honestly with such admitted grievances. Disaffection exists and has vital force in Ireland, not merely because it is actively propagandized from America, but because that propaganda finds the mind of the people in a state of despair, touching any real redress of their grievances on the part of Parliament. The first axiom of Mr. John Mitchel's political teaching in 1848, was that "no good thing can come from the English Parliament;" and it may be admitted that the principal measures which have come from Parliament since 1848, the suspension of the Writ of Habeas

Corpus on two occasions, three Arms Acts, the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, and Mr. Cardwell's Landlord and Tenant Act, are not of a character to contradict his doctrine.

Now, however, with the second suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, admittedly necessary as it is for the good government of the country, we are promised not merely a series of important measures, but the adoption of new principles of policy in dealing with the affairs of Ireland. The land question, by far the most important of Irish questions, which, indeed, so far as the peace, prosperity, and good government of the country are concerned, exceeds in its gravity all the rest of them put together, is, we are rejoiced to see, regarded with all the seriousness it deserves by the Government. We are confident that we are speaking the all but unanimous sense of the Irish Catholic clergy and of all the laity, who are not otherwise personally interested, when we say that they would willingly see every other question, the Catholic Oath, the Catholic University, the Church Establishment, postponed for any reasonable period if only the present Parliament would undertake to achieve a satisfactory settlement of the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland. We are bound to admit that in the speeches of Lord Russell in the House of Lords, of Mr. Gladstone to the deputation of Irish Members, of the Attorney-General in the House of Commons, and of the Chief Secretary at the hustings of Louth county, their responsibility in this matter has been fully accepted by the Government.

We have also to recognise that, if we may trust the announcement made of its scope by the *Times*, the policy of the measure to be proposed by Government is a right and statesmanlike policy. The State has, in Ireland, to deal with a body of landlords, who, as it has been repeatedly proved before Parliamentary Commissions and Committees, have never made, do not now make, and cannot even in future be expected to make, the ordinary agricultural improvements necessary for the efficient cultivation of the soil; and who, as a rule, insist on keeping the population of the country in the condition of tenants at will, in order that they may have the power of taxing by enhanced rent the progress of agricultural improvement. The policy of the proposed law is to encourage leases; and it proposes to do so by giving the tenant a claim against the landlord for such improvements as he may have made in the case where there is no written agreement between them. We believe that Parliament might with great advantage go a step further, and render the landlord liable for all local taxation, such as the Poor Rate and County Cess, as well as the Tithe Rent Charge, unless in cases where there is a

lease of the kind recognised by the law as an agricultural lease, which, we presume, will be for a minimum period of 31 years. The natural operation of an Act of this kind, infinitely beneficial to the landlords themselves, would be to cover the country with small leasehold properties, in which the tenantry would have a sufficient stake to induce them to improve the land to its utmost value. Such a tenantry would have a direct daily interest in the good will of their landlords, and in the peace of society and the State, and would in the course of ten years be as Conservative as the peasant proprietors of the Continent. It is absurd to suppose that a tenantry at will, at the mercy of Irish agents and bailiffs on the estates of landlords, absentee whenever the property is considerable enough to permit foreign residence, can have any such interest in the soil or in the State. Let it not be supposed that we hereby deny the existence in Ireland of landlords, as benevolent, honourable, and eager for the good of their people, as any in the United Kingdom; or even, that several of the estates of large absentee proprietors are most justly and considerately managed. The estate of Lord Dunraven, a resident landlord; of Lord Devon, an absentee, are examples of this class; and their management might, we believe, be fairly compared with that of any property in England or Scotland. But will even the most thorough-going advocate of the Irish landlords, as a class, deny that these cases are exceptional, and very much in the minimum, and that the disposition of the Irish landlord towards his people is in general very much more like that of the Russian boyard towards his serf, or the Carolina planter towards his negro. And as slavery and serfdom have now been abolished, it is surely time to have done with tenancy at will, and that secret superadded legislation of the agents and bailiffs, called "the rules of the estate." Let the law provide a simple and concise form of agricultural lease; and let this be taken as a normal standard of the relation of landlord and tenant. Where it does not exist, let the prejudice of the law lie against the landlord. The prejudice of the law has lain long enough against the tenant; and it needs to be specifically reversed. One maxim of law, that "whatever is attached to the soil belongs to the soil," has had the effect of confiscating all the agricultural improvements, which separate the present state of Ireland from its condition in the original state of nature, and which have undeniably been made by the tenant class for the benefit of the landlord. No one asks that the law should presume all existing improvements to be the property of the tenantry, and yet this would be within a reasonable equity. What lawyer, what political economist will



deny the right of the State, considering all the circumstances of Ireland, to enact at once that unless in cases where there is a lease, agricultural tenure should be presumed to be, not from year to year, but for a period of seven or ten years, with right to compensation for improvements? If Parliament and the English people were once thoroughly convinced what a small proportion of the duties expected from a country gentleman, the Irish landed proprietors, as a class, discharge, and what injury the State incurs in consequence, we believe measures such as we now only hint at, would hardly be reckoned radical enough. As it is, the general apprehension among the friends of the Irish tenantry seems to be that whatever measure may be passed by Parliament, the landlords and agents will contrive to pervert or to negative its provisions. We have no apprehension of this kind. We believe that the force of public opinion upon the great majority of landlords will strongly impress them with a sense that it is their interest to make a settlement of their property according to the system laid down by law. We believe that their own class in England and Scotland will, as Lord Houghton did in the debate in the Lords, advise them to sacrifice some of their rights to the general good of the country. We are sure that those who refuse will fare worse in the end. A farmers' strike, on an estate where leases according to the terms of the Act were refused, would have all the support of public opinion in this country, where strikes are now a recognised machinery for adjusting the interests of class with class. As the *Times* already gives the hint, in an article praising the skill and energy with which the Trades Unions conduct their affairs:—"These men have gone instinctively to the root of their own business. *If Irish peasants were but half as able, we should soon hear the last of the Irish Land Question.*"

We gladly recognise the increasing disposition of the Government to deal with Catholic interests in a large and generous spirit. This has been remarkably evinced in the new form of oath proposed to be taken by Members of Parliament, in which everything that could be, however remotely, considered offensive to the Catholic conscience, was omitted. Nor have we any desire to waste complaint on the amendments which Mr. Disraeli, on the part of the Conservative Party, proposed, and one of which was adopted. There can be no objection (we speak under correction) on the part of Catholics to recognise in the oath of allegiance that Act of Settlement by which the present dynasty holds the crown. Were any great change in the faith or policy of the country to take place, there is no reason why the Act of Settlement or any part of it might not

be repealed like any other Act. The second amendment, which contained more debateable matter, was properly opposed by the Government and the Catholic Members, and rejected; and we hope the House of Lords may pass the oath in its present form; if not, we can afford to wait until it is in a better humour. To get up any very great indignation on the subject is, we believe, an effort impossible to such Catholics as are not devoted to mere party politics. There are much more gross and perilous questions demanding all their prayer, and care, and energy. It was, therefore, we think, peculiarly to be regretted and decidedly calculated to discredit Catholic politics in the regard of all impartial persons, to find an attempt at agitation commenced in Ireland on such a ground as the misprint of the word "country" for "courts," in the telegram which conveyed to the Dublin papers the text of Mr. Disraeli's second amendment. The worst of such a "blunder of the sudden" as this is that it indicates a predetermined party bias. This is to be regretted. No greater injury could, in our belief, be inflicted upon Catholic interests in the Empire than if the supposition could be again accepted that their political allegiance belongs of right to the Liberal Party. A Catholic in the present day is as free to form political alliance with one party as with the other; and may certainly find at least as many reasons from a strictly Catholic point of view for allying himself with the Conservative as with the Liberal Party; and it is for the general advantage of Catholic interests that this should be so, and that either Party should have something to hope and something to gain from Catholic support. For this reason, however, and *à fortiori*, we, instead of desiring to see Catholics in the House of Commons tailed off to vote against each other in all the great party divisions, maintain, in accord with the Synodical address of the Irish Bishops in 1859, following up and endorsing many previous acts of the Irish clergy and laity, the policy of sustaining and recruiting the Party of Independent Opposition, as a true *Tiers Parti*, free to support, free to attack either side, as the interests which it holds itself bound to advance and defend may demand.

The subject of University education is still in course of negotiation between the Government and the Irish Bishops, and although the tone of the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed a little to waver under the pressing interpellations of Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Lowe, there is good reason to expect that a satisfactory conclusion, considering all the circumstances, will be attained. In waiving the claim to a special charter for the Catholic University, as a University, the Irish Bishops have, we take for granted, sufficient reasons. As yet the Government

have not laid before Parliament the new charter, which it is proposed to confer on the Queen's University. Upon its provisions, and upon the controversy concerning the Colleges, in which the name and principles of this REVIEW are very much and in general very absurdly interpolated, we hope to be able to express our opinion in our next number.

Through the multifarious discussion of Irish grievances and problems of government, which the Fenian movement has provoked, the remarkably able letters of Mr. Aubrey de Vere, on the endowment of the Roman Catholic clergy, have attracted much attention. No words of praise upon our part can be too high to express our sense of the earnestness, eloquence, and sincerity with which Mr. de Vere has argued this most difficult question. But there are two objections to the project, which, it seems to us, are fatal—at least to the prospect of any advantage from its discussion at present. One is that, in our opinion, the English people are not, and are not likely to be, humanly speaking, for years to come in the condition of mind to consent to an endowment of the Catholic Church; and the other is that the Roman Catholic hierarchy and clergy and people seem to be still strongly averse to the project of such an endowment. Moreover, the time is eminently unpropitious for proposing such an arrangement in another respect. It is one of the characteristics of Fenianism both in Ireland and America, that wherever it has gained power, the old influence of the clergy over the people has been seriously shaken. We fear that their apparent willingness to accept a State Provision now would directly tend to weaken still more, and render suspected, that influence which has always, on the whole, been so wisely and so holily employed.

Much is also said and written as to the necessity of appealing to the strong sentiment of loyalty, which, despite the spread of Fenianism, is generally believed to dwell in the Irish breast. It is urged that the viceroyalty should be abolished, that the Queen should more frequently visit, and that one of the Royal Princes should occasionally reside in Ireland. But if Fenianism be indeed the formidable conspiracy that it is represented to be by the Government itself, then it is one of its certain results that it has given to the Irish viceroyalty a new lease of life. If there had been no authoritative executive in Ireland for the last three months, and Sir George Grey had been directing the operations of Government against the conspiracy from the Home Office, perhaps the loyal would not have as much cause for congratulation as is now evinced. The Queen and Royal Family have always been well received when they visited Ireland, even at times when her Majesty's Government

was eminently unpopular. But we are convinced, such is the Irish nature, that if it were supposed she was induced by her ministers to visit Ireland against her own inclination, and for considerations of policy, the result would be satisfactory neither to the Sovereign nor to the nation. Her Majesty's personal movements within her dominions are free. She has a right to select her own residences and her own recreations. If she does not care to visit or to reside in Ireland, it is to be regretted; but in good taste, the less that is said on the subject the better; and it is remarkable that the Irish, who may be supposed to feel it deeply, do in reality say very little about it. Let us have the hardihood here, however, to allude to a question of loyalty, upon which there is a conspiracy of silence, but which we take leave to think involves a most gross and offensive stigma upon the character of the Irish nation. Why is the volunteer movement not extended to Ireland? Why, of all her Majesty's subjects, domestic or colonial, are Irishmen alone now forbidden by the law to associate themselves for self-defence against foreign war or domestic treason? It will not be seriously maintained that such a movement could be turned to Fenian account. It is the precise boast of the Government that no person who had any property or any interest in the prosperity of the country was concerned in the Fenian conspiracy. In Ireland, as in England and Scotland, the class who would form volunteer corps are precisely the class, sober, educated, and industrious, who have an interest in peace, law, and order—not mere day-labourers or inferior mechanics,—but young professional men and students, young merchants and their clerks, the country gentry and their yeomen. Why does the Government hesitate to avail itself of this great additional bulwark for the public security? Can it be doubted that Lord Wodehouse and Sir Hugh Rose would have felt much more confident of the public peace, if they had known that in the event of any local "rising," there was a local volunteer corps, ready to aid the police—and that in the event of a general insurrection there were 100,000 Irish volunteers at the disposal of the Government? No one can doubt that in England or Scotland such a consideration would be felt to be the surest strength of the State. Why not in Ireland? Not because disloyalty pervades all classes in Ireland. This the Government emphatically deny, and maintain that it is limited to one class—a class from which volunteers are not drafted in this country or any other. Or is it, as Lord Palmerston once with blameable levity observed, because religious feeling is so strong in certain districts, that Catholics and Protestants would

probably use their arms against each other in celebration of Patrick's Day, or the Battle of the Boyne? The answer to this is easy and ample. The class who form volunteer corps are not the class who form Riband or Orange Lodges. In the Irish militia and the Irish constabulary, who come from a lower class, there has never been a serious manifestation of a sectarian character. The *esprit de corps* absorbs such feelings, and the *esprit de corps* is rather stronger perhaps in volunteers than even in the Line. When the Queen does visit Ireland again, why should it not be to review the Irish volunteers in the Phoenix Park, as she went to Edinburgh to review the Scotch volunteers? and why should not Irish volunteers parade to receive her in their national green and gold, as the Scotch did in kilt and philabeg? Why not endeavour in Ireland, as in Scotland, to blend the sentiment of nationality with the sentiment of loyalty?

There is no reason that we know but that British statesmen as yet hesitate to trust to the natural instincts and affections of the Irish people, and prefer to govern them, not as an equal and co-ordinate nation, but as a race in a state of political pupillage. In the most memorable passage of Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Address there is the promise, upon his part at least, to abandon this system; and we quote and hail the words, because they contain the assurance of the only system upon which the relations of Ireland to the empire can ever be satisfactorily conducted:—

For my own part, I will only say that I consider we are a united people with a common Government, with a complete political incorporation. But we are also a United Kingdom, made up of three nations, welded politically into one, but necessarily and, in fact, with many distinctions of law, of usage, of character, of history, and of religion. In circumstances such as these there are common questions, which must be administered upon principles common to the whole empire—all these questions in which the interests of the whole overbear and swallow up the interests of the parts. The composition of a Government must be determined, not by domicile or birthplace, but by the competency of those who are chosen to fill office. The levying of taxes in, and the administration of all the public revenue, must be governed by principles applicable to the three kingdoms alike. The general rule in these cases should be alike applicable to all; subject, perhaps, to well-defined exceptions; and, if exceptions are made, they should be exceptions, not in favour of any class or party, but in favour of the whole country alike. But there are many other questions with regard to which in England, Scotland, and Ireland, that interest which is especially English, Scotch, or Irish predominates over that which is common; and, with regard to questions falling within that category, we ought to apply to Ireland the same principles on which we act in the two other countries, and legislate for them according to the views of the majority of the people of that country.

This seems simple truism, yet such are the unhappy circumstances of Ireland, that if Mr. Gladstone will only devote himself to the policy which is indicated in these words, he may leave a name truly greater in the annals of Imperial statesmanship, than that of either Pitt, and as much beloved in Ireland as that of O'Connell.

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

*Acta Concilii Florentini.*

*The History of the Council of Florence.* Translated from the Russian by BASIL POPOFF. Edited by Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. London : Masters.

IN an earlier article we have carefully considered that dream of corporate union, in which Dr. Pusey has indulged. Before Dr. Pusey joined the Unionist party, that party had been assailed with similar arguments by the Archbishop, the Bishop of Birmingham, and others; who showed that the scheme is based on principles, which every Catholic must reject as contradicting the very foundation of his faith. No answer whatever to these arguments—so far as we have observed—has ever been attempted by the Unionists. They have contented themselves with appealing to a certain fact of the past, the Council of Florence; and they have challenged an opponent to explain that fact, if he can, in any way consistent with his hearty denunciation of modern Unionism. In our present article we frankly accept that challenge.

We begin with an illustration from the present day. A pious and able Anglican has trained his sons carefully in his own religion. They have hitherto been regular and steadfast in all Anglican religious practices; have rested content with their position; have looked up to him with confidence as their teacher; and so look up to him still. Why is it that the Roman motives of credibility—intrinsically so strong—have produced on these youths little effect, or rather no effect at all? Because their father's authority, from its very proximity, has eclipsed an object which, though immeasurably greater, is yet very far more distant. But now the father himself is rewarded for his faithful correspondence with grace, by a keen misgiving of his position, and a keen suspicion that the Roman claim is just. He seeks a priest's acquaintance, and makes him the intimate of his home. The priest carefully abstains from unsettling the three sons in their *bona fides*: because he is devoting all his spare time to their father's



case; and he has a moral certainty, that if he convinces their father, their father will convince them. All this is most reasonable. The paternal authority has hitherto hidden from them the Roman motives of credibility; but when these motives, in addition to their intrinsic strength, come recommended to them by that revered and trusted sanction, the result cannot be doubtful. Yet what could be more ludicrous, than to represent so common sense a procedure as being the father's "negotiation" with Rome, on behalf of self and family?

Now this is a true parallel to the circumstances of Florence. The great mass of Christians, subject to the Greek Emperor, were joined together in strict unity of belief; and looked up with unquestioning confidence to him, their bishops, and their priests. Those strong worldly motives, which had hitherto been so influential in fostering the schism, were now overborne by an opposite motive still more powerful; and Emperor and bishops were thus led to entertain the thought of reunion. They expressed, therefore, their desire of examining whether, by mutual explanations, the ground of difference might be removed. It is no business of ours to defend the Greeks; though in fact their fault lay, not in seeking explanation now, but in not having sought it earlier. But we are here concerned only with the principles implied throughout by Rome and by the Roman Catholic Church. Nothing could have been more unchristian than the Pope's conduct, had he shown himself indifferent to such overtures. There was everything to make success probable. The one point which—more than all the rest put together—had kept the more pious and intelligent Easterns in schism, had been their obstinate persuasion, that the Westerns ascribed to the Holy Ghost two Principles of origination.\* No Latin theologian ever lived who would not have admitted, that if (per impossibile) Rome had upholden this, she would have lapsed into heresy and fallen from the Catholic Church; only he would of course add, that God has bound himself by promise to avert from Rome any such grievous lapse. The Pope, therefore, well knew that the one consummation, most devoutly to be wished, was the freest interchange of thought between East and West; so that this strange and calamitous misapprehension might be removed. He was also well aware, that with the great body of Photians nothing had so powerfully promoted their separa-

\* This is distinctly mentioned in the final Decree of Union. "The Greeks declared . . . that the Latins [had] appeared to them to assert that the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son as from two principles and two spirations."

tion, as their national recalcitration against Papal supremacy ; and it appeared that this temptation was at the then juncture indefinitely neutralized, by the far more intolerable sacrifice of independence, which threatened them from Turkish domination. The case then was this :—There was great hope that the Greek delegates, by free intercourse with the Westerns, would come to recognise the obligation of ecclesiastical submission to Rome ; there was also great hope, that if they were convinced, they would persuade their episcopal and sacerdotal brethren ; and there was moral certainty, that if these were persuaded, the whole flock would follow. What can be weaker, than an attempted parallel between such circumstances as these and the position of Anglican Unionists ? Not to dwell on other contrasts,—who are those Anglican dignitaries, or who those individuals of any kind, possessing such influence over their brethren's conviction, that the former, on accepting truth, can be expected at once, and as a matter of course, to persuade the rest ? Undoubtedly, if such influential men did exist, and if they were now presumably in invincible ignorance of Catholicism, it might be the Church's true policy to concentrate all her efforts on their illumination and conversion. But the very hypothesis supposes a stagnation of religious thought in large masses of men, to which surely no parallel can be found in modern Europe.

However, even if such individuals did exist among Anglicans—though the most extreme Unionist will not gravely maintain that they do—our principle remains absolutely untouched. Nothing whatever, said or done by the Westerns at Ferrara or Florence, can be alleged as giving the slightest support to any such notion, as is required for a defence of Unionism ; to any such notion as that individuals, convinced of the Roman claim, can delay for one moment their firm resolve of unreserved submission, without formally committing mortal sin. Any of the Eastern bishops, while the Council lasted, so soon as they respectively accepted the Roman claim and made the corresponding act of faith, became at once Catholics. They were actually engaged in the work (as one may say) of *hypothetical* submission ; they were actually engaged in arrangements for again subjecting themselves to the dominion of Rome, *in the event* of their being convinced that her claim is well founded. On making, then, such an act of faith as above supposed, that hypothetical submission became an actual one. We shall presently see a striking instance of this, in the Patriarch Joseph, who died at Florence.

But the objection may perhaps take a wider range. It may be alleged—indeed it seems often implied by the Unionists—

that the question throughout was not one of unreserved submission, but of "negotiations," "conditions," "terms." We maintain in reply, that any such statement indicates a complete misconception of the whole proceedings. We admit, of course, that there was much *explanation*; that the Westerns laboured earnestly to remove that fatal misapprehension of Roman doctrine on the Double Procession, which kept alive the disastrous schism. It would have been monstrous indeed had they not laboured thus earnestly. Suppose an Englishman at the present day to think honestly that Rome, whether in her formal or her practical teaching, ascribes to Mary an equality with God. If this misapprehension were invincible, he would be under the strictest formal obligation (while it so remains) of keeping aloof from her communion. In such a case, however, the priests with whom he came in contact, would of course take all possible pains for the purpose of explanation. Is there any one living so puzzle-headed or so unfair, as thence to infer that such priests waive thereby the Church's claim to unreserved submission? The whole world would of course see that, from their point of view, they are in no way imperilling faith, while fulfilling a peremptory duty of charity.

For similar reasons, the Westerns laboured zealously and successfully to convince the Greek bishops, that neither the addition of "*Filioque*" to the Symbol, nor the doctrine expressed by that addition, was in any respect contradictory to patristic principles. Then again there were matters of discipline. Universally men are far slower in finding out that this or that duty obliges them, in proportion as the duty is more burdensome and distasteful. Now with a people so peculiarly sluggish and stationary in religious thought as the Eastern Christians, the abandonment of an old and time-honoured practice would be the most distasteful and burdensome prescription in the world. But in the case of other duties, every one admits the Christian wisdom of removing, as far as possible, every temptation which militates against their fulfilment; why then should the particular duty of submission to Rome be counted an exception? The Pope acted most wisely therefore, in permitting the continued absence of "*Filioque*" from every public recitation of the Symbol; in leaving without innovation the Eastern rite; and in according to the patriarchs, even to him of Constantinople, their existing places and privileges, so far as consistent with his own divinely given supremacy.

But if an Unionist, or any other controversialist, means to say, that the Pope represented such concessions as conditions

on which they had a right to insist ;—that he shrank from distinctly claiming, for the Church in communion with Rome, her divine authority, as the one ark of salvation, the one infallible teacher of Truth ;—such an allegation is disproved by the most superficial study of what took place at Ferrara and Florence. Whether you look at the preliminaries, the deliberations, or the definitions of the Council, the falsehood of this allegation is equally apparent.

But this is really to understate the fact. That the Church in communion with Rome is infallible ;—that all nations of the earth are peremptorily bound to enter her communion on her own terms ;—that the Pope is her divinely appointed centre of union, and is invested by God with a certain supremacy over all other bishops ;—this (as Archbishop Manning has pointed out) is held by Gallican and Ultramontane alike : it is the very foundation, on which every Catholic builds his faith. That this great truth was expressly and prominently testified by the Westerns at Florence, it is the first purpose of our present argument to establish. But more than this is undoubtedly true. It was not the *Church* of Rome only, but the *See* of Rome, for which infallibility was claimed. The duty held forth as incumbent on all nations, was not simply communion with the Roman Catholic Church, but unreserved submission to the Roman Pontiff. The Western doctrine at Florence—to which the Easterns ultimately gave their full assent—was in no respect Gallican, but purely Ultramontane. Here then are the two theses which we undertake to establish. Thesis the first : “The Westerns at Florence represented the Roman Catholic Church in no other light, than as constituting exclusively the One Catholic Apostolic Church ; as teaching infallibly ; as the one ark of salvation, which all men are commanded by God to enter.” Thesis the second : “The Westerns at Florence represented the Supreme Pontiff in no other light, than as infallible in all his teaching *ex cathedrâ* ; as invested by God with fullest spiritual supremacy over all baptized persons ; as not limited, in the exercise of that power, by any human authority whatever, whether bishop or council ; but on the contrary, as himself the one sole source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction.” Of these two theses, it is the former only which is required for our present argument, and on which therefore it is necessary here to insist. But it is plain that the second, if established, adds indefinite corroboration to the first. Moreover, as we shall need the second for our future article on Papal supremacy,—and as of course every portion of the Council’s procedure throws much light on every other portion,—it seemed far more convenient to consider the second thesis

also in this place. Indeed, as the Florentine is remarkable among all councils for being that one, wherein Catholics and Schismatics met to promote corporate reunion ;—so also it is remarkable among all for being that one, wherein the assembled Church formally and solemnly defined her doctrine on the Pope's primacy.

We have said that we include in our general argument the "preliminaries" of the Council. We cannot exhibit our meaning on this head more clearly, than by a few extracts from Popoff's work, mentioned at the head of this article. Take, for instance, the following :—

On receiving from Constantinople the sudden news that the Turks had made several movements hindering the convocation of a Council, the Pope delayed his projected plans, and sent his nuncio, Antonio Massana, to make some preliminary arrangements as to the place and time of the Council, and the conditions under which the union might take place. The Emperor received the nuncio very graciously (Sept. 16, 1422) ; and had already named the day for treating on the conditions, when of a sudden he was taken to his bed, struck by a fit of apoplexy, and was thus obliged to entrust all State affairs to his son John.

After much delay, Antonio managed at length to lay the Papal demands first before the Emperor, and then before the Patriarch, in the presence of the other bishops. The nuncio declared, that the Pope heartily wished for the union ; demanding only that the Emperor should, according to his promise, *receive the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and obey it* ; that the Pope is agreeable to a convocation of a Council, but wishes to know when and where it will be convened. In answer to this unexpected demand, a letter was sent from Constantinople, stating that the Emperor gave *no unconditional consent to the union* ; but only promised to convene a Council like unto the seven Œcumenical Councils, and assent to all the decisions of the Fathers, made by them under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost (pp. 15, 16).

Then next year—

John, on his return from Hungary, renewed his negotiations with Rome concerning the Council ; but this time the legates found their former proposition of assembling the Council at Constantinople strenuously opposed by the Pope. The Cardinals, *with strange assurance*, told them that "*the Church of Rome is the mother, the Eastern Church the daughter* ; it is not usual for the mother to go to the daughter, but the daughter to go to the mother ;" and then demanded the convocation of the Council in Italy (p. 17).

And lest the Easterns should misunderstand the sense in which he agreed to a council, Pope Martin V. expressed himself with great frankness.

The Pope, on the other hand, proposing to the Emperor to assemble a Council in Italy, was far from wishing that the causes of disagreement be-

tween the Churches should undergo lawful investigation by a Council. This was only *the wish of the Greeks*, to which, as he says himself, *he acceded from condescension* (p. 185).

Harassed on all sides, the Emperor was brought to the necessity of acceding to the Papal demands. He forthwith sent an embassy to Rome, with his consent to Martin's proposal (p. 18).

The legates came to Rome only in time to be present at Martin's death-bed (Feb. 20, 1431). He was succeeded by Eugenius IV. (March 3, 1431). In his letter to the Emperor and Patriarch, the new Pope agreed to assemble a Council in Italy, but evinced no great energy in its cause. The Greeks *were very much offended with several of his expressions*, and rather troubled with some demands not mentioned to them by Martin (p. 19).

Popoff adds, indeed :—

Very soon the Council of Basle made the Pope more attentive to the scheme of the union of Churches, and induced him to lay aside his pride and arrogance while in intercourse with the Emperors of the East (*ib.*).

But throughout his volume he gives no hint, nor have we found anywhere a hint, of Eugenius giving the Easterns any different impression of the Papal claims. And so, when the Patriarch ultimately arrived at Ferrara—

The Emperor informed the Patriarch that the Pope expected him to bend his knees before him, and kiss his shoe. *This was a sad blow for the Patriarch*, who little expected such a welcome from his brother in Christ. While at Venice, he said to one in the Pope's confidence : "If the Pope is older than I am, I will respect him as a father ; if my equal in age, I shall look upon him as my brother ; if younger, he shall be as a son to me." In the afternoon six bishops were sent to congratulate Joseph on his arrival, and *demand the usual obeisance to the Pope*. The Patriarch told the bishops straightforwardly that he could only consent to a brotherly embrace ; and, assembling his bishops, indignantly told them of the papal demand. The Metropolitan of Trebizond reminded him that he was advised, while in Venice, to think upon the subject carefully ; but then his answer was, that the Pope would receive all with honour and respect. The Metropolitan of Heraclea declared that he and the Metropolitan of Monemvasia, when presented to the Pope, did not kiss his shoes, and cared very little for his anger. Meanwhile, the Emperor sent another messenger, saying that he was still disputing with the Pope as to the means of preserving the Patriarch's dignity. Joseph made the following answer to the bishops sent a second time to him by the Pope : "Tell me, why does the Pope appropriate such privileges to himself ? What Council, what Church canon, has confirmed this custom ? If the Pope is the successor of the Apostle Peter, we are the successors of the other Apostles. And did the other Apostles kiss Peter's feet ? Who has ever heard of this ?" The legates answered that the custom was of ancient date, and that bishops, kings, the Emperor of Germany, and even the Cardinals, who are higher than the Emperor, remain true to it. But the Patriarch with great decision kept



to his former demand of a brotherly welcome from the Pope ; promising, in case of refusal, not to land, or let any of his bishops do so either. At last the Pope acquiesced to Joseph's demand, pretending a sincere desire for peace (pp. 38, 39).

Eugenius, of course, did not "pretend," but really entertained, "a sincere desire for peace." He refused, however, to receive the Greek Bishops in public, lest a false impression should be produced, that he waived his claim of supremacy ; or as Popoff amiably expresses it, "to conceal his forced humility from the people."

Passing from these preliminaries to what took place afterwards—and by way of contrast to what we have just stated—it should be observed, that when peace was concluded and the Easterns had accepted orthodox doctrine, their demeanour to the Pope was most different. "As the other fathers, the Latin, came to the Supreme Pontiff, kissing the hem of his garment and doing him reverence, *so also did the Greek Fathers.*"\* Joseph, indeed, the good Patriarch of Constantinople, exhibited by Popoff in so invidious a light, was not on earth to see that day ; but it so happens, that he also had an opportunity of exhibiting a similar change of spirit. The very day before his death he wrote his last testament, which runs thus :—

Joseph, by God's grace Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Œcumenical Patriarch. Whereas I have attained the limits of my life, and shall soon have to pay the universal tribute : I do now with God's help announce my opinion to all my children. I do myself confess and agree to everything held and taught by the *Catholic and Apostolic Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, the elder Rome*. I avow the Pope of the elder Rome to be the most blessed Father of Fathers, the Supreme Pontiff, and Vicar of Christ. I certify this before all. I admit the Purgatory of Souls.†

As to what followed Joseph's death, the writer of the Latin Acts, who was present at the Council, gives these particulars ; to which we solicit particular attention. "There seemed so many and such great proofs of [the Patriarch's] complete conversion [totalis reductionis] that the Supreme Pontiff, with approval of the assembly of Latins, *pronounced him admitted to the Church's communion* ; and he was buried with a great pro-

\* Latin Acts, just before they recite the Decree.

† Popoff indeed adds (p. 145) that "there are reasons for doubting the truth of this narrative ;" which he proceeds to give. Our general argument is of course wholly unaffected by the question. But both the Greek and Latin Acts contain this testament ; and Gibbon and Milman, impartial judges, accept the narrative as genuine.

cession of prelates, all the most reverend cardinals assisting, &c., &c.”\*

All this, it will be at once admitted, tells very forcibly for our first thesis; and is in full accordance, so far as it goes, with our second. Then there is another circumstance, recorded both in the Greek and Latin Acts, which also bears on our first thesis.

Three Eastern bishops, whom the Pope had urged to forward matters, “pressed” the Emperor much for the union; saying this to him, among other things, “if your majesty (*ἡ βασιλεία σου*) refuses to be united, we are united [without you].”†

And the Latin writer brings out the implied doctrine somewhat more clearly. “Shortly the report transpired, that several of the Greek fathers, who had hitherto said nothing, went to the Emperor and Patriarch, stating that *since God had manifested to them the Truth*, they intended to follow it.”‡ Had these Easterns understood the question to be, whether two independent societies could come to terms of union, the whole of this would have been simply unmeaning. Those who are acquainted, ever so superficially, with the position held in ecclesiastical affairs by a Greek emperor, must admit that if he were not brought to terms, corporate union could not be thought of. In such an event, these prelates declare their intention of providing for their own souls, by personal submission.

Let us next refer more particularly to our second thesis; let us consider the language held by the Western champions concerning Papal prerogatives, throughout the deliberations. For instance. It was a most vital controversy between West and East, as all our readers are well aware, whether the Church had any right to add “Filioque” to the Nicene Symbol of Faith. On Nov. 11, 1438, the Bishop of Forli stood forth to vindicate this right. What ground did he take up?

And since you touch but superficially on the authority of the Roman Church, wishing afterwards to enter on it more profoundly [viz., when the formal discussion of Papal prerogatives should come before the Council], you imply nevertheless that you deny the power of adding to the Symbol of Faith, even to Œcumenical Councils and the Universal Church; *much more to the Roman Church*. To this we answer that such liberty and authority cannot be taken away from Œcumenical Councils, or the Universal

---

\* Recorded just after the twenty-second Conference.

† Recorded in the Greek Acts shortly after Bessarion's speech.

‡ Recorded shortly after the twenty-second Conference.

Church, or the Roman Church, either by ourselves or by the fathers who went before us ; for she possesses it by divine right.

Observe he is now going to set forth the special grounds, on which he claims for the Universal Church a power of adding to the Symbol : and his ground is simply this, that *the Pope* has been invested by God with that power.

We need hardly point out, what is so obvious from the context ; viz., that in what follows, "the Roman Church" does not mean "the Church in communion with Rome," but (according to well-known theological usage) "the local Church of Rome, directed by her Bishop."

He proceeds thus :—

This authority of the Roman Church is demonstratively (evidenter) inferred from S. John's Gospel, when our Saviour committed to Peter *the care of the whole Christian flock* :—"If thou lovest me, feed my lambs and my sheep." And this authority is manifestly declared by the fathers of Constantinople, and of other ancient councils ; and by Athanasius ; and Agatho, in that letter which was confirmed by an Universal Synod, in which he expressly says that *the faith of the Roman Church ought to be observed by all Ecumenical Councils and by the Universal Church*. It is declared also by S. Jerome, the excellent disciple of your theologian Gregory. For in the profession of faith which he makes to Pope Damasus he says :—"This is that most blessed Faith, which we have learned in the Catholic Church, which we have always retained, wherein, if perhaps anything has been incautiously laid down, we seek to be corrected by thee, who holdest both the Faith and the See of Peter ; but if this confession of ours be approved by the judgment of thy Apostleship, whoever shall have wished to blame me will prove himself [either] unlearned (imperitum) or [else] ill-intentioned, or [else] no Catholic, but a heretic." Nor is it wonderful, most learned fathers, that it should be decreed that every judgment concerning faith must be brought before the *chief of the faithful*, the first [in rank] of mortal men . . . And therefore it is necessary that *by one and the same prince of the Church should be determined, what is to be held by all as certain and defined of faith*.\*

On the same question, at an earlier period, the Archbishop of Rhodes thus speaks :—

But [to prove] that the Roman Church has authority thus to develop (*ἀναπτύσσειν*) [the Creed], for the present we will bring forward one only Greek citation, whereby it shall be shown that *this throne of Peter* has alone power of developing the Faith ; and moreover, that never have the gates of hell, that is *heresies*, prevailed against it nor even touched it . . . This Church, whose office it is to develop all truths of the Faith, has accepted this truth [the Double Procession] [as] being necessary for men's salvation ; for without this truth, implicitly or explicitly received, it is not possible that men's

\* Latin Acts, Conference 10.

salvation can be attained (*συνεσθάναι*) : therefore the Roman Church had both the power and the obligation of doing what she did [*viz.*, adding "Filioque" to the Symbol]. If therefore, oh fathers, you will agree with what we have to-day brought forward, there will be no need of further investigation (*οὐκ ἂν εἰν ἱρίων χρεία πραγμάτων*) ; but *shutting up our books*, let us embrace this truth and be united in the Church of God.\*

Nothing can be more legitimate than Orsi's comment on this :—

These arguments "are adduced by the Archbishop to prove that the See of Peter acting alone, without authority of a General Council, had the power of adding 'Filioque' to the Symbol, and *compelling to its profession all who desired salvation* ; and that after this oracle of the Apostolic See, there is no need of further inquiry, or of consulting other books and authors."†

Cardinal Julian rises, immediately after the Archbishop has concluded. He reads Pope Agatho's letter to the sixth Œcumenical Council, and draws from it his conclusion.

I will recite the letter :—"If I [Agatho] should conceal that truth which *I have been commanded to impart to all who need it* by these words—'Feed my sheep,' and 'Thou being converted confirm thy brethren ;' *since on us lies the obligation of teaching Christians those things, which appertain to the true Faith . . .*" And a little earlier, "the whole Catholic Church of Christians and all Œcumenical Synods *faithfully embracing his teaching . . .*" and the rest. Hence it appears [adds the Cardinal] that so often as any doubt arises concerning the Faith, *the Roman Pontiff* ought and is bound (*δρᾶναι καὶ ἐνίχεται*) *to clear it up* ; and when he teaches, *all synods and the whole Church should follow this truth.*

The conclusiveness of such testimonies arises from this ; that no other view of doctrine was put forth in the Council, by any Western champion from first to last. It is admitted, of course, or rather maintained, by Bossuet himself, that the Westerners claimed infallibility for the Church in communion with Rome. What we here point out is, that this infallibility was invariably rested by them, not on the prerogatives of an Œcumenical Council, or of the general Episcopate ; but exclusively on the Divine promises made to S. Peter's See. The direct drift of this argument is, of course, to fix the sense of that Decree which was finally passed. But for this purpose, what has hitherto been adduced—powerful though it be in itself—is really insignificant, as compared with what is next to follow. Shortly after recounting the Patriarch's death, the Latin Acts proceed thus :—

\* Greek Acts, towards end of Session 7.

† Orsi, de Pontificis irreformabili Judicio, l. i. c. 37, a. 2.

And because doubts remained [on the Easterns' mind] concerning the [Pope's] Primacy ; and concerning the consecration of our Lord's most Sacred Body ; and because the question had remained in suspense, whether it had been lawful for the Roman Church to add to the Symbol ; the Latin fathers presented to the Greeks these papers (*cedulas*) . . .

"We define that the addition '*Filioque*' . . . &c. &c.

"Also that the Body of the Lord . . . &c. &c.

"Also we define, that the Holy Apostolic See and Roman Pontiff is successor of Blessed Peter head of the Apostles, and true vicegerent (*vicarium*) of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and is the father and teacher of all Christians, and possesses a primacy over the whole world ; and that to him, in [the person of] Blessed Peter, there was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding, ruling, and guiding the Universal Church ; as is also (*quemadmodum etiam*) contained in the acts (*gestis*) of Œcumenical Councils and the sacred canons.

"Renewing, moreover (*renovando insuper*), the order of the other venerable patriarchs [as] laid down by the canons ; so that the Patriarch of Constantinople be second, after the supreme Roman Pope ; of Alexandria, third ; of Antioch, fourth ; and of Jerusalem, fifth : that is to say, their privileges and rights being preserved (*salvis*)."

Which papers having been presented, since the Greeks had as yet heard nothing from our [champions] on these last conclusions, they asked [to do so] . . . and a day was fixed on which two [theologians] were appointed to dispute [on these matters] in the presence of the Supreme Pontiff, the Greek Emperor, and the other fathers of the Eastern and Western Church.

We are here only concerned with the Primacy. On this, John the Dominican Provincial was the appointed exponent of Western doctrine. He took the above (proposed) definition as his text, except the "*quemadmodum*" clause ; arguing for it point by point : and we here subjoin a few extracts from his oration. We translate "*vicarius*" vicegerent ; because the extremely strong significance of the word sometimes almost escapes notice, from its frequent use in controversy.

These words follow in the paper :—"And vicegerent of Jesus Christ." This portion in itself presents no difficulty . . . *That Peter remained on earth in Christ's place*, is manifest from the Gospels. For Christ founded upon Peter that Church, which had been founded upon Himself ; and gave him the keys universally and generally . . . *He excepted no one in the whole world*. From which it follows that *he can bind all, and be bound by none* . . . and since the Roman Pontiff succeeds in the same power, it follows that he is vicegerent of Christ. For this very purpose indeed holy doctors say that Christ appointed Peter prince of the apostles ; viz., that the Church should have [over her] one supreme vicegerent of Christ, *to whom all the members might recur if haply they disagreed among themselves*. But if there were different heads, the bond of unity would be broken . . .

The Universal Church, however it be considered, *whether assembled* [in

*Council*] or no, has the relation of members in respect of the Roman Pontiff ; and the Roman Pontiff is always supreme over them [præponitur], as the head over the members.

Then that he is teacher of the whole Christian Faith, is shown from the synodical letter of Athanasius which he wrote to Pope Felix . . . Since all Christians agree and are required to (*debeant*) agree in faith, *he is appointed teacher of the undefiled Faith*, because of the privilege granted to Peter . . .

John then quotes Agatho's letter, at somewhat greater length than Cardinal Julian had done on the earlier occasion.

"This, the Apostolic Church [of Peter], *never wandered into any portion of error* ; the authority of whose [Peter's] sanction, Christ's Catholic Church and all *Universal Synods* have ever embraced. . . . This Apostolic Church is the spiritual mother of your empire, which, through the grace of Almighty God, *has never failed by wandering from the path of Apostolic Truth* ; but . . . *remains unspotted to the end, according to the Saviour's promise*. . . 'Peter, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou, having been converted, strengthen thy brethren.' Consider that the Lord himself, Whose Faith it is, *Who promised that Peter's faith should not fail*, admonished him to strengthen his brethren : which, as is well known to all, *my Apostolic predecessors have always strenuously performed*."

And in this authority [adds the Provincial] three things are manifestly asserted. Firstly, that to feed all the sheep has been entrusted to Peter and his successors. Secondly, *that the Apostolic See has . . . ever remained spotless in faith*. Thirdly, . . . that the words, "that thy faith fail not," are [rightly] understood [to have been said by Christ] *concerning the Apostolic See* ; [and to imply] that it is [ever] free from heresy, and that the strengthening of all who totter in faith, *appertains to that See and to the Roman Pontiff*.

This, observe, was the authoritative explanation, tendered by Latins to Greeks in full Council, of that definition which was proposed for their acceptance. "The Pope," said the Westerns, "is supreme over all Christians without exception—patriarchs, bishops, priests, and laymen—either separately or when they are assembled in council. He is the one authority, to whom all are commanded to resort if they disagree concerning the Faith. Christ prayed efficaciously that the Roman Pontiff's faith should never fail : and hence it follows, that the Roman Church has never been touched by heresy, nor will be unto the end ; and that it is the Roman Pontiff's duty to strengthen all others in the Faith."

And now we come to the actual Decree concerning Pope and patriarchs, as signed by Pope, Emperor, and bishops. It will be found to agree almost (but not quite) word for word, with the paper originally presented to the Greeks.



We [Eugenius IV.], with the approbation of this sacred Universal Florentine Council . . . define that the holy Apostolic See, and the Roman Pontiff, possesses primacy over the entire world; and that the Roman Pontiff himself is successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles; and is Christ's true Vicegerent, and head of all the Church, and father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in [the person of] Blessed Peter, has been given, by our Lord Jesus Christ, full power of feeding, ruling, and guiding the Universal Church; as is also contained in the Acts (*gestis*) of Œcumenical Councils and in the sacred canons. And we renew (*renovantes*), moreover, the order of the other venerable patriarchs [as] laid down in the canons; so that the Patriarch of Constantinople be second after the most holy Roman Pontiff; of Alexandria, third; of Antioch, fourth; and of Jerusalem, fifth: that is to say, all their privileges and rights being preserved (*salvis—σωζομένων*).

The other bishops subscribed the Decree, each naming himself after his see: but Eugenius subscribed at the head, naming himself "bishop of the Catholic Church."

Two most strange propositions concerning this Decree have lately been put forth in the *Union Review*: viz., (1) that the existing Latin is not that originally signed, but a translation made from the Greek 150 years later; and (2) that the word "continetur" is not a true translation of the Greek "*διαλαμβάνεται*." We replied in January (pp. 284-288) to these truly marvellous allegations; and we are now writing, before the March number of the Review has appeared. If any reply is attempted therein to our argument, we shall not fail to rejoin; here we must consider ourselves to have refuted statements, of which it is most astonishing to think that they can ever have been made.\* Now then for the substance of the Decree.

In the first place, no one can attempt to deny that it irrefragably establishes *the former* of our two theses. Gallicans maintain indeed, that the Papal supremacy, proclaimed by it, is not ecclesiastically absolute †; but limited in its exercise by some human authority. This question we shall immediately proceed to consider. But so much is evident on the surface: the Decree ascribes to the Pope a *certain* divinely given supremacy over the universal Church. The Decree decides, consequently, that any society, which yields to the Pope no

---

\* Since the above was in type, a most singular article has appeared in the *Union Review*. We reply to it in our "Notices."

† We use the qualification "ecclesiastically," to avoid possible misconception. Of course, in one sense, the Pope's supremacy is not absolute, because it is restrained by God's Law within certain limits; and (as Ultramontanes consider) it is infallibly preserved by His Providence, from transgressing those limits. But we regard it as *ecclesiastically* absolute; i.e., as controlled in no respect by any *ecclesiastical* person or body on earth.

submission at all, is external to the ecclesiastical organization which Christ set up; or (in other words) is external to the Visible Church. Neither Dr. Pusey nor any other Anglican can accept the Decree, even in that sense for which Bossuet and De Marca contend, without admitting his present position to be one of schism; and the Easterns, in signing it, acknowledged themselves to have been hitherto (materially at least) schismatics and spiritual rebels. All this, we say, is absolutely incontrovertible; and no one has ever thought of denying it.

But we hold it as incapable of any fair doubt, that the Decree establishes our second thesis as well as our first; that it is conclusive against Bossuet, as well as against Dr. Pusey. In order to evince this, we must first state the method adopted by the former, that he may elude (what we must call) the one obvious and undeniable sense of most intelligible words.\* The final sentence, above quoted, is of course a disciplinary enactment, not a doctrinal decree. Of the Definition properly so called, the last clause runs thus in the original Latin; both as first proposed to the Greeks, and as finally signed by them:—*“Quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.”* No one would have imagined, *à priori*, the slightest difficulty in the interpretation of these words. Christ has given the Pope plenitude of power; “as is contained or expressed [not in this Decree only, but] also in the acts of councils and in the sacred canons.” Nor assuredly is any the slightest philological difficulty introduced by the Greek translation of the above words:—*“καθ’ ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται.”* Bossuet, however, translates these words (*Déf. Cl. Gall. vi. 11*) “*according to that method which is contained, &c.*” And he understands them to mean, that the Pope’s power is ecclesiastically limited in various particulars, which have been before now expressed in councils and in canons.

1. Now, firstly, the original Latin, at all events, utterly refuses any such interpretation. No one ever dreamed, in any other case, of translating “*quemadmodum*” “*according to that method which.*” Even if this unexampled violence were done to language, what can be said about “*etiam*”? By no imaginable manipulation or perversion, can it be made consistent with the rival theory. This is frankly admitted

---

\* The work from which we quote throughout is the “*Défense de la Déclaration, &c.*” It is extremely doubtful, however, whether Bossuet be the real author of that work; which is certainly very unworthy of his illustrious name.

indeed (see our January number, p. 285) by the Gallicans, De Marca, and Launoy; who suggest, accordingly, that the word found its way into the text by some error. Bossuet himself, however (*ib.* p. 286), testifies personally to the fact, that the text, as it stands, is that to which the names of Eugenius and the rest are affixed; while De Marca, again, cannot deny that S. Antoninus, a contemporary of the Council, quotes the text just as we have it now. Indeed, he is actually driven to suggest, that the Greeks were *cheated* into subscription by the Latins. See, then, the position of these three Gallicans. De Marca and Launoy admit that the text, if genuine, is inconsistent with their tenets; and Bossuet testifies that it is genuine.

2. It is *imaginable*, of course, that the Greek text might present on the surface so much discrepancy from the Latin, as to necessitate a certain violence of interpretation. But can any man in his senses allege this in the present case? We believe that any ordinary scholar, who saw the Greek by itself, would at once translate it in substantial accordance with the Latin. And this for two reasons. Firstly, "*καθ' ὃν τρόπον*," we believe, signifies more commonly "*quemadmodum*" than anything else. Acts xv. 11 is commonly appealed to in the controversy; and with very good reason:—"*πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι καθ' ὃν τρόπον κἀκεῖνοι*,"—"We trust to be saved, even as (*quemadmodum*) they were saved." Bossuet would translate this, we suppose, "We hope to be saved [not absolutely, but] according to that particular method of salvation which they achieved:" few, however, would follow him in such a translation, if he attempted it. Then the whole texture of the Florentine clause protests against its Gallican rendering. According to Gallicans, the sense here intended is, that the Pope has "supreme power;" confined, however, within those limits which have been laid down in councils and canons. How in the world could men have thought of conveying so simple a thought, in so perplexing a way? "Restrained within those *limits* which have been laid down" is expressed "according to that *method* which is contained."

3. Moreover, according to the Ultramontane interpretation, the clause is exactly what was to be expected. Ecumenical Councils are seldom contented with simply defining a doctrine; they ordinarily add, that this doctrine has been held in the Church from the first. In like manner, according to Ultramontanes, the Florentine Council not only defines the Papal supremacy, but adds that it has been asserted as of Divine institution by councils and canons.

4. Further, on the Gallican view, this decree contradicts

itself. The very lowest sense which can be given to the words "full power," is surely "power limited by no human authority." According to Bossuet, then, the Council decides that God has given the Pope a full power, which, however, is *not* full. Then how very strong a phrase is "Christ's *true vicegerent*." Gallicans themselves hold, that the Church is a society placed by God under one supreme earthly government. He, then, who is Christ's *true vicegerent*, must be he, and he only, who wields that government in all its plenitude.

5. The Latin definition is admitted by Bossuet to have emanated from the Council; he must admit it, therefore, to be infallible. But the Greek definition also issued from the Council; and his argument turns on the assumption, that in sense it contradicts the Latin. He must hold, therefore, that the Council issued two contradictory infallible decrees.

6. If so monstrous a hypothesis could be made, as that the Latin and Greek decrees really differ in sense;—then that one would be authoritative (even on the Gallican view) which was confirmed by the Pope. But Bossuet himself tells us, that it is the Latin to which Eugenius subscribed his name.

These arguments are intrinsic to the decree itself; but we may confirm them from extrinsic sources.

7. It is admitted by Gallicans, that the Greeks at Florence accepted the Roman Catholic doctrine, concerning the Church's indivisible unity and her supremacy over all nations. But, as we pointed out a few pages back, throughout the deliberations this Roman Catholic doctrine was presented to them exclusively in its Ultramontane form. If this or that Latin champion persuaded them at all, he persuaded them surely of something which he maintained; not of something which he did *not* maintain. If he persuaded them, *e.g.*, that *the Roman Catholic Church* is infallible, he did so by persuading them that *the Holy See* is infallible; for no other seat of infallibility was spoken of at Florence by the Westerns at all.

8. It is worth while, also to quote here the Profession of faith, on Papal supremacy, which had been made by the Easterns 150 years earlier at the second Council of Lyons (Denz, n. 389). It runs thus, having been put into shape by Pope Clement IV. :—

The holy Roman Church herself possesses supreme and full primacy and principedom over the whole Catholic Church; which she truly and humbly recognizes herself to have received, together with the fulness of power, from the Lord Himself, in [the person of] blessed Peter, the prince or head of the Apostles. And as, before other churches, she is bound to defend the truths of faith (*fidei veritatem*), so if any questions concerning the Faith have arisen, *they should be defined by her judgment*. To which [Church] any one may

appeal who has been aggrieved on matters belonging to the ecclesiastical forum : and in all causes relating to ecclesiastical inquiry, reference can be made to her judgment ; and to her all churches are subject, their prelates yield her obedience and reverence. But [this] fulness of power so resides in her, that she admits other churches into a part of her solicitude ; many of which, and especially the patriarchal, *the same Roman Church has honoured with divers privileges* ; preserving, however, untouched her own prerogative, as well in General Councils as in certain other particulars.

Here, it will be observed, there is no qualification, at all resembling that which Bossuet would insert into the Florentine Decree. And it is not very probable, that Rome would be content with a less full profession from the East in the fifteenth century, than she obtained from it in the thirteenth.

9. We have already pointed out, that the decree, finally passed, was almost word for word that originally proposed by the Westerns. It is in itself imaginable, no doubt, that the Westerns might have made *concessions* to the East ; but here (we see) there is no question of concession, but of the paper which the Westerns themselves originally prepared. Now, it must be remembered, that the controversy concerning Papal power, raised so long afterwards by Bossuet, was at this very time most actively pressed, between Eugenius and the Florentine Westerns on one side, and the schismatical Synod of Basle on the other. It is not very probable, you will admit, that the Florentine Westerns should draw up their own paper in such a form, as to leave an opening for errors which they considered so serious. Moreover, Orsi opportunely reminds us\* that we have most unexceptionable evidence what was Eugenius's doctrine, in the "*Assertiones Eugenianorum*" at the Congress of Mayence (*Diæta Moguntina*) ; which took place less than two years afterwards. Orsi thus quotes them.

That the Pope is superior to all Christians ; and *in such sense to a General Council, that he gives it its power*. That a General Council has not power immediately from Christ, but *from Blessed Peter and his successors*. That the Church's supreme tribunal and supreme judgment on earth *resides with the Pope alone*. That the use of the keys (*exercitium clavium*) in the fulness of power appertains on earth to the Pope alone, *who can do all things on earth*. That a General Council is *as sterile sand unless it be fertilized by the Pope*.

To these cumulative arguments, two principal replies may be found in Bossuet's work. One of these will be more conveniently considered, somewhat later in our article ; the other

---

\* *De irreformabili Judicio*, l. i. c. 37, a 2.

is based on the various conferences which took place between the Latins and Greeks, in reference to this very definition. We will first then give a narrative of these various conferences. We cannot, indeed, do any justice to the controversy between Bossuet and Orsi, without drawing out this narrative to some considerable length. Yet we hope our readers will forgive us for so far taxing their patience; as we shall be thus led to present them with a very interesting and characteristic scene, in an important drama. Our authority throughout, unless we expressly state to the contrary, are the Greek Acts of the Council, written by Dorotheus of Mytilene, an ardent promoter of the Union.

Our narrative goes back to the Dominican Provincial's oration, from which we above selected several extracts. Our readers may remember that we took that speech from the Latin Acts; the Greek Acts merely mentioning its delivery, but giving no particulars whatever of its purport.\* A paper, it will be remembered, had been "placed by the Latins before the Greeks" as the basis of a definition. The Provincial argued for the contents of this paper on the Primacy, as we have seen; and he was succeeded by Turrecremata, who argued for it on the question of the azyma. No objections to either of these arguments were made by any Eastern bishop: Mark of Ephesus, (who remained to the end obdurate in schism) having apparently been absent. But the Emperor was grievously offended. Indeed, to understand the scene which follows, it must be remembered that the Eastern bishops were labouring to unite two conditions, somewhat difficult of reconciliation; viz., faithfully to testify the truth so far as they had accepted it, and at the same time to keep the Emperor in good humour. An Emperor, who writes a history of Julius Cæsar, is a startling exception to all general rules; nor can it be expected that an ordinary specimen of the class, and that, too, in the fifteenth century, should be remarkable for speculative or theological acumen. Turrecremata then completed his oration. 'No further discussion is now needed,' said the Pope; 'let the definition and union be accomplished.'† 'No further discus-

---

\* Many controversialists, on both sides, are far more learned than the present writer. If any of these will show him any mistake into which he may have fallen—whether from ignorance of authorities, or from imperfect study of those which he has consulted,—he will gratefully attend to such criticism. He confesses to a total ignorance of Syropulus's history of the Council. He has taken Popoff as representing those Easterns who were averse to Union; the Greek Acts as representing those favourable to it; and the Latin Acts as representing the Westerns.

† When we quote the actual words of Greek or Latin Acts, we use double inverted commas (" "); otherwise we profess to give only the purport of what took place.



sion is needed,' replied the Emperor; 'I shall go back to Constantinople at once.' 'At least take with you the paper which we have drawn up,' replied Eugenius, 'and answer us as to its contents.' But the Emperor was unwilling to gratify him even so far as this; nor would he have even taken the paper, had not the bishops (as it were) compelled him to do so. 'I have no more to say,' he continued; 'in Florence I can remain no longer.' The Pope suddenly rose and left the assembly; overcome with grief and disappointment, at this sudden check to his hopes in the very moment of their expected fulfilment:\* but he entreated Cardinal Julian Cesarini to do all he could towards changing the Emperor's mind. The Cardinal at once assured the latter that—union or no union—provision should be made for his safe return; and that on this head at least, there was no cause for anxiety.

The Easterns now went back with the Emperor to his abode. "We all met there," says Dorotheus, "and examined the Latin demands: we found them five in number, *and all just and good*. Firstly, concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost; secondly, concerning the unleavened and leavened bread; thirdly, concerning the Pope's rule; fourthly, concerning the addition [to the Symbol]; and fifthly, concerning Purgatory. And we urged the Emperor . . . that he would complete the work; but he would not."

The reader will observe, that the paper drawn up by the Westerns on the Primacy, precisely as it stood, was considered "just and good" by every Eastern bishop except Mark of Ephesus.

All this took place on Tuesday June 16, 1439. The Emperor's present mood seems to have brought him back into relations with the said Mark of Ephesus: for the next day he invited a committee of his bishops to confer with Mark; hoping, probably, that he might bring them round by his influence. In vain, however. "Jackdaw remained jackdaw," concludes Dorotheus, and the time was wasted.

The next day (Thursday June 18), "the Pope sent for the Eastern Church to come to him; and when they came, he commissioned two teachers, and they again held forth concerning his prerogatives: how that he is Supreme Pontiff, and Peter's successor, and Vicegerent of Christ, and *judges and directs the Catholic Church as her teacher and shepherd*. Then they taught also concerning the Sacred Bread . . . When they had spoken much of these things, we left the Pope's

---

\* Ταῦτα ἀκούσας ὁ πάπας ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν, ὡς ἰδύξει, λυπούμενος.

presence; and after dinner we assembled at the Emperor's abode, and recited to him the whole: for he had not gone with us to the Pope." These dissertations were avowedly delivered, in consequence of the Emperor's disgust at what had been said by the same two speakers on the former occasion; and it is therefore of considerable moment, to observe what was precisely set forth by John the Provincial this second time. The Latin Acts here again repeat his speech at length.\* The Emperor, indeed, refused even to be present at the explanation, so disgusted did he still remain; but it appears from the Latin Acts, that Cardinal Julian had, in the interim, waited upon him, and learned from him the particular statements at which he had taken exception. "The most serene emperor," begins the Provincial, "has desired to have some explanation; and in order that the explanation might be fuller, he has given it in charge to the Archbishop of Nicæa [Bessarion], that he should make objections for us to answer." Now in consequence of what afterwards occurred, the reader must pay particular attention to John's first response. All who look at the speech will be struck throughout with the extreme frankness of his explanations.

The day before yesterday, in illustrating the particulars stated in that capitulum [viz. the proposed definition placed before the Greeks], I adduced testimonies from certain epistles, which were despatched by the Holy See, and received with great veneration by those Œcumenical Councils: among which, three epistles were quoted in particular: that of the Chalcedonian Synod to Pope Leo; an epistle of Pope Hadrian . . .; and one of Pope Agatho.† And with regard to those epistles, it was said [by the Emperor to Cardinal Julian] that those phrases which we quoted from these epistles seemed words *expressed (vaguely) for the sake of honour*; and such that they did not carry with them so much authority as [certain persons, i. e., the Emperor] could have wished: and that [said persons] could have wished to see *canons or capitula of councils*, from which those things may be inferred which are laid down in the paper and capitulum [proposed as a definition on] the Primacy. To this objection I thus answer: that those decretal epistles, *since they were all synodical epistles*, have no less authority than canons themselves: nay, *they seem to have greater authority*; because your Paternity well knows that in all Œcumenical Synods in which definitions of faith have been made, before such definitions were promulgated, *it was necessary to produce testi-*

\* They date it, indeed, on the 20th instead of the 18th. The matter is of no moment: but in all probability Dorotheus's date is correct; because he chronicles all the events of each successive day, from this time to the completion of the Union.

† This little confusion of expression (the mentioning a letter of the Chalcedonian Synod to the Pope, as though *despatched* by the Pope), originates with John or the narrator, not with us.

*monies and epistles of the Saints, from which [sources] the fathers of councils promulgated their definitions and canons : so that that [further act of] the definitions (id definitionum) was performed on the strength of those testimonies. And you know that in the third [Œcumenical] Synod . . . [epistles were read from Popes Julius and Felix], and if these had not been of authority as canons [i. e., as rules to guide men's faith], they would not have been read ; but whereas they were synodical epistles [i. e.—as the editor explains from the immediate context—epistles sanctioned respectively by local Roman Synods] they were of greater authority than canons which were made in [other] synods, because the Holy Ghost works in the Roman Church as in other councils. The letter of Pope Agatho was of such great authority . . . that the sixth Œcumenical Synod did not dare to add to that definition which had been made in the Roman Synod. . . In no way can it be said that [Pope Agatho's] epistle is of less authority than canons . . . Therefore it is to be said that these decretal epistles which have been sent concerning such great matters of faith, contain truth, and contain nothing of falsehood.*

This then is John's argument. 'Since the dicta sanctorum, which I quoted in confirmation of our doctrine, include synodical epistles from Popes, they are not to be considered as of less authority than canons of councils, but rather of more ; since such synodical epistles contain the very direction, which the Council is obliged to follow.'

The next question asked by the Emperor was this. "You say that [the Pope] is father and teacher and guide of Christians. We would wish to understand, whether by these words a certain reverence is denoted, as that he is first among patriarchs ; . . . or any power is introduced over and above reverence." And the sequel shows, that the Emperor particularly wished to understand, whether he was expected to recognize the Holy See as having any authority over *himself*. John answers with unmistakeable clearness ; and we wish we could transcribe the whole of his admirable exposition. We will give a very few specimens.

This power, which is in Peter and his successors, is called the power of spiritual jurisdiction, being directed to the salvation of all Christian souls. And as regards this power, both clerics and laics are subjected thereto : the laics in those things which concern the salvation of their soul. For instance, if they have committed sin, it specially appertains to their spiritual pastor that he should correct and reclaim them, as is evident. And so if they acted against the Faith, and acted as some emperors did, who persecuted their *Metropolitans*, and it was necessary to resort to the Apostolic See ; and in like cases : *since the end [pursued by] the Apostolic See is the Church's peace, in order that through that peace men might arrive at eternal glory . . .*

Neither does this do any prejudice to the Emperor's [true] power ; because this lies in things civil and temporal, the other in things ecclesiastical and spiritual : . . . and these are the two powers, one of which assists the other :

and Leo therefore says—"Things cannot be secure, unless *those matters which pertain to the knowledge of God are defended at once by the royal and the sacerdotal authority*. And therefore it is said that God made two great lights. And because *the spiritual power is the more noble . . . this power is likened to the sun.*"

The Emperor had next asked whether a power was claimed for the Pope—rather than for the Emperor—to call together Ecumenical councils. John replies, "assuredly." "Although the emperors convened councils, when they possessed government over the whole world (*monarchiam mundi*); we say that this was done by the Pope's commission and consent." Lastly the Emperor had inquired on the authority claimed for the Pope over patriarchs. John replies that the Church is not built on "three or five patriarchs, but on Peter." He adds, that originally the Alexandrian and Antiochene patriarchates had come in dignity next after the Roman: still in honour of S. Peter, whose disciple S. Mark founded the Alexandrian See, while Peter had himself once presided at Antioch. In due time however, John proceeds, the Constantinopolitan patriarchate obtained precedence over both. "The Constantinopolitan Church is also a daughter of the Roman, and honoured with many privileges: nor does the Roman Church wish to disturb her privileges; but, on the contrary, wishes to preserve their privileges both to her and to the other Churches." He explains, however, that whereas no Patriarch has authority in another patriarchate, "the successor of Peter has *over all men* the immediate power of a superior:" just as "Moses was superior over all Jews; but because he could not suffice for them all, *he appointed certain other men* [to assist him]."

Turrecremata followed on the Eucharist; but there is no reason for our entering on this question, and we return therefore to the Greek Acts.

The same day, Thursday, June 18th, the bishops went back straightway to the Emperor, and reported the proceedings. On the Eucharist we find no more said; as to the Supremacy, his interest seems to have been considerable, and a great impression to have been made on his mind. The whole of that day, all Friday, and all Saturday, were spent by the bishops and himself over their books; in searching for precedents, and "examining the privileges of the Churches." On Sunday they wrote down their conclusion. They admitted all the prerogatives claimed for the Pope, except two: (1) the absolute authority ascribed to him in the matter of assembling Ecumenical Councils; and (2) his power of summoning a patriarch to Rome in answer to a complaint of injury. "Let the Pope rather send inquisitors into the patri-

archate itself," and there do justice to the injured party. On Sunday evening the Emperor took this answer to the Pope, and received next day a very decisive rejoinder. "On Monday, Eugenius sent three cardinals to the Emperor; and replied that he desires (*θελει*) [to have] all the privileges of his Church; that he desires [personally] to receive appeals; to direct and feed the whole Church of Christ, as *shepherd of the sheep*; besides this, that he have the authority and power of summoning an Ecumenical Council when necessary; and that *all the patriarchs should obey his will*."

"The Emperor, on hearing this, gave up hope; and gave no other answer except, 'prepare if you please [at once] for our return [home].'"

This, however, was June 22nd. On June 24th, the Nativity of St. John Baptist was kept at Florence with unusual solemnity. On the 25th, three of the Eastern bishops mediated between Pope and Emperor; and the two, having met together, agreed that four Eastern deputies should meet four Western, and discuss the whole question. After this had taken place and was concluded, the Greek bishops consulted together, and then wrote as follows:—

Concerning the Pope's rule, we confess that he is Supreme Pontiff; and steward and vicegerent and vicar (*ἐπίτροπον καὶ τοποτηρητοὺν καὶ βικάριον*) of Christ; the shepherd and teacher of all Christians; and that he directs and guides the Church of God: the privileges and rights of the Eastern patriarchs being preserved (*σωζομένων*), so that he of Constantinople be second after the Pope; then he of Alexandria; after him, of Antioch; then, of Jerusalem.

"When we had written this," adds Dorotheus, "we determined to write or do nothing more; but that if this were not received by the Pope, nothing further should take place." They heard at once, however, that it had been well received by him; and the next day two of them (one being Dorotheus himself) went to the Pope, and said, "Behold, our most serene Emperor *has consented to everything your Blessedness wished; and we have all done everything you desired*. And for no other reason did we decline to stand out [further] except for the sake of briefly completing the transaction."\* They added a hope, that the Union might be completed on the forthcoming Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul.

Here let us pause for a moment, to look at the Latin account of the theological conference which issued in these results. Cardinal Julian announced it to the Pope and Westerns; and on the Supremacy he spoke thus:

---

\* This last sentence will be afterwards considered.

The last point of difference was on the Primacy: and this seemed more difficult [than the rest], through human [weakness]; because subjects readily deflect from [obedience to] their head: and in truth, up to this time, they have not held just opinions on the power of the Roman Pontiff: . . . and having heard sacred Scriptures and Councils, *the truth was seen by them*—viz., that the Apostolic See and Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter. Then by disposition of Divine mercy it came to pass, that the Greeks assented *according to the paper given in by the Latins*. They then said that we ought to hold some deliberation on the patriarchal sees—viz., that that of Constantinople should be second.

On Saturday evening, then, June 27th, three bishops came from Eugenius to the Emperor, announcing that the Union was agreed to; that next day all might sign the Decree; and so that the solemnity might take place, as had been desired, on Monday the Feast of the Apostles. On Sunday morning, accordingly, Latin and Greek delegates met in the Church of S. Francis, wrote out the Decree, and brought it to the Emperor. It did, not, however, at all please him. Firstly, he would not consent that the Pope's name should appear without his own. Secondly, the Decree had been so worded as to re-open an old sore. It has been seen that he objected from the first to the Provincial's argument, from the dicta sanctorum. 'The Saints,' he had replied, 'might often use some expression, when speaking of a Pope, not in its literal sense, but by a kind of complimentary exaggeration,' "*Videbantur verba per modum honoris posita*;" as his words were quoted by John the Provincial, in order to answer them. And now he repeated the same objection. Dorotheus thus reports the scene. The proposed Decree "contained (*διελαμβάνει*) also [a clause] concerning the privileges of the Pope: viz., that he should have them, as is determined by Holy Scripture and the dicta sanctorum. And neither did this please the Emperor. 'If any of the Saints,' he said, '*in some letter honours the Pope*, should one [be bound to] accept this [as answering] for [Papal] privileges?'"

Here arises an historical difficulty. The Latin Acts expressly state, that the final clause of the definition stood originally just as it now stands. How can it have been then, that the form now brought to the Emperor ran: "*quemadmodum definiunt Scripturæ Sacræ et dicta sanctorum*;" or in some equivalent words? Our argument is not in the least affected one way or other by this difficulty; but we see no way of solving it, except by Orsi's supposition. The dicta sanctorum, as we have seen, include, as their most prominent portion, the synodical letters of Popes. The Latins were of course, therefore, much shocked at the Emperor's disparagement of them; and Orsi supposes that they wished to obtain from him a tacit revoca-



tion of his error, by introducing "dicta sanctorum" into the Decree.

However this may be, there the words stood; and he at once resorted, for the third time, to his old threat. 'Let these things be changed,' he said, 'or to Constantinople I shall at once return.' As to his first objection, no difficulty was made: the Pope at once agreed to add in the Decree, after mention of his own name, "by consent of Emperor and Patriarchs," as in fact it now runs. But on the dicta sanctorum, the Pope now made a stand. "How can we better prove the primacy," asked the cardinals, "than from the dicta sanctorum"?\* "No," answered the Emperor, "let it be according to the effect of the canons" (κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν κανόνων).†

Our readers will have observed all through, that the question does not turn in the slightest degree on expressing any *limitation* of the Pope's prerogatives; but on the *historical testimony* to those prerogatives, which shall be stated in the Decree.

So the Feast of the Apostles, on which the Union was to have taken place, was passed in suspense and anxiety. Nothing, however, was done on the matter that day; probably because the Holy Father was occupied in its solemn celebration. On the 30th, the Greek bishops assembled in the morning, and discussed the state of affairs; some laying the blame on the Latins, and others on their own Emperor. Meanwhile, the cardinals went again to the latter; and finding him intractable, entreated him at least to take counsel with his bishops: and this he agreed to do. In the evening, therefore, both cardinals and Greek bishops assembled in the Emperor's presence. Cardinal Julian entreated the Greeks not to let the union fall through, for the sake of these dicta sanctorum. "Through these dicta," argued he, "the Symbol of Faith was formed; and the holy sacrifice [duly ordered]; and every part of the canons [enacted]; and without the dicta sanctorum, nothing was [ever] done." The Emperor consulted with his Bishops, and the consultation issued in their extemporizing ("σχεδιάσαντες") a definition, "that the Pope should have his privileges, according to the canons, and the dicta sanctorum, and the Divine Scripture, and the acts of synods." This the cardinals took back with them to the Pope, and so the day closed.

On Wednesday, July 1st, the cardinals brought back the defi-

\* Πῶς δυνάμεθα κρείττορίως ἔχειν τὴν ἀρχήν, παρ' ἧς γράφουσιν οἱ ἄγιοι;

† Through some strange hallucination, a writer in the *Union Review* (Nov., 1865, p. 687) says that the final Decree was "in some respects short of what the Greeks required," because it omitted the "dicta sanctorum sacramque Scripturam."

tion, just as it finally stood.\* And it was so fortunate as to give the Emperor satisfaction. We can find no reason assigned, for the rejection of the draft extemporized by the Easterns; but we think it not difficult to guess. The Pope would undoubtedly object to the *order* in which the Greeks had placed their respective "*loci theologici*." Scripture, if mentioned at all, should be mentioned first: this however, no doubt, the Greeks would have conceded. The real difficulty would be, the "*canons*" being mentioned before the "*dicta sanctorum*." It is obvious that the Pope would prefer the total omission of these latter, to that disparagement of them, which was involved in placing them after the "*canons*;" and it was probably felt to be a very hazardous experiment, troubling the Emperor further on the matter.

On Thursday July 2nd six of each party met, wrote out the Decree, and brought it to the Emperor. Then rose the last contention; and this time on the Latin side. The Easterns had earnestly pressed for an explicit preservation of patriarchal rights and privileges; but the word "*all*" had crept in, by some mistake of transcription. The Westerns were not unnaturally disturbed, at what might appear foul play; and the signature was thus deferred over Thursday and Friday. But the Pope no doubt (though this is not stated) overruled their objection. On Saturday the Decree was written, and on Sunday signed. Finally, on Monday, the Octave day of the Apostles, the Pope celebrated high mass, surrounded by Easterns and Westerns; the Decree of Union was solemnly read in both languages; and Eugenius IV. called on "*heaven and earth to rejoice*," because "*the wall was*" at length "*broken down*, which had" so long "*separated the Western and Eastern Churches*."

We have given this narrative at much length, in order that our readers may fully understand the controversy raised on it between Bossuet and Orsi; nor have we knowingly omitted any one particular, on which controversialists of any school would desire to insist. Bossuet maintains that the Pope indeed originally put forth Ultramontane pretensions, and wished to embody them in the Decree; but that, in consequence of the Eastern resistance, he abandoned all attempt to do so. Orsi denies that there is the slightest trace of any such abandonment; and we certainly consider that he has triumphantly proved his point.

---

\* According to the Greek Acts, the Cardinals said, "*The Holy Father has accepted two papers, and commissioned us to choose one of them.*" Which was the other, and why this was preferred, does not appear.

Bossuet's argument is twofold. First he dwells on the Eastern declaration, put forth on June 26th, that they admitted the Papal prerogatives, patriarchal privileges "*being preserved*" (*σωζομένων*). Here, argues Bossuet, is a distinct protest on their part, against any theory of the Pope's ecclesiastically absolute and unlimited power. Now the expression does, or does not, involve such a protest, according to the sense you give it. So far as the words go, they *may* mean, no doubt, "patriarchal privileges being exempted by God's appointment from the fulness of Papal power." But they may quite as naturally bear a sense altogether different: viz., "the patriarchal privileges being preserved, however, by Papal sanction." Our readers will remember how distinctly the Provincial had protested against any suspicion, that the Pope had any wish whatever to disturb those privileges; and the Emperor would very naturally wish to obtain some definite promise of such non-interference. The question then is, which of these two interpretations is correct: the former interpretation given by Bossuet, or the latter by Orsi. We say, the latter; and we give three reasons for our opinion.

In the first place, it is absolutely impossible for the Easterns to have thought that the Constantinopolitan patriarchate—which, however, they distinctly mention—had received its privileges immediately from God. They themselves always rested those privileges on the secular pre-eminence of Constantinople; and even could they otherwise have been ignorant of notorious facts, the Provincial had recently reminded them, that the privileges claimed for that patriarchate had been quite of modern date. In the second place, refer to Cardinal Julian's account of that interview between the Latin and Greek delegates, which led to the latter drawing up this formula. He says that *after the Greeks had fully assented to the Papal claims*, "they said that we ought to hold some deliberation on the patriarchal sees; viz., that that of Constantinople should be second." They did not consider then the patriarchal privileges as *limiting* the Pope's divinely given power; but, on the contrary, as a matter to be separately discussed, after having fully admitted that power. In the third place, look at the final Decree: "We, Eugenius IV., with approbation of this holy Council, *define*, &c. *renewing* the order, laid down in the canons, of the other venerable patriarchs . . . all their privileges and rights being preserved." No words can possibly be plainer than these, in declaring, that the patriarchal privileges issue, not from Divine law, but from ecclesiastical concession; and yet the Greeks never objected to these words from first to last.

It may be argued, indeed, on Bossuet's side, that when the Eastern Bishops had drawn up the above resolution, they "determined," as Dorotheus tells us, "that if this were not accepted by the Pope, nothing more should be done;" as though meaning that they had gone as near to the Pope's wishes as they could in conscience, and that they would admit nothing further. But here again the words in themselves *may* have quite a different signification. They may merely signify: 'We have stated in our own way the full doctrine for which the West contends; and if this does not satisfy the Pope, no more can be done.' Here, then, is the issue. Did they mean to say 'we *have*,' or 'we have *not*,' accepted the full Papal doctrine proposed to us? And, as it happens, we have evidence absolutely irresistible for the former alternative. Two Easterns—one the very writer of the Acts—went next day to the Pope on the matter. Did they tell him that they had gone as near to his wishes as they possibly could? Did they beg him to be satisfied, with something less than he had demanded? On the contrary: "The Emperor," they said, "has acquiesced in everything which you sought; and we have all of us done all that you desired." And the Pope, in reply, neither on the one hand consented, nor on the other hand refused, to make some concession. He spoke just as any one would speak, of whom no concession was even asked. 'I thank you for your zeal in the matter, and hope, with you, that the union may take place on the Feast of the Apostles.'

As to Bossuet's first argument, then, we must maintain that it is demonstratively confuted. Secondly, he dwells on the curious scene about the *dicta sanctorum*; and strangely misconceives its purport. He considers that the Greeks were here pressing on the Latins some limit to Papal authority. We have already shown (under Orsi's guidance) the true character of that scene. But Bossuet's whole theory on this head is completely overthrown by one simple fact. The "*quemadmodum*" clause—whether worded this way or that way—whether to be understood in this way or that way—*was not originated by the Greeks at all*; it was both introduced and supported exclusively by the Latins. The only doctrinal statement deliberately drawn up by the Greeks (as distinct from the later one which they extemporized) is that which we have just considered; and it contains no "*quemadmodum*" clause at all.

In truth, it seems to us that far more controversial capital may plausibly be made out of these final conferences, by an Anglican Unionist, than by a Gallican. He may argue in some such way as this: "Even up to the time of signing the Decree,

the Greeks were never fully penetrated with the doctrine, that the Church in communion with Rome is the One Catholic Church. For from that doctrine it would of course have necessarily followed, that they were under the immediate obligation of entering the Roman communion, whether the Pope did or did not make concessions to patriarchs or Emperor. Whereas they continued to the end stipulating for such concessions, as a requisite for union."

We reply, firstly, that the only relevant question concerns the Pope's conduct; and it is on his conduct, indeed, that the Union Reviewer (September, 1865, p. 569) rests his general argument. Undoubtedly, according to the Roman Catholic creed, it was Eugenius's clear duty to receive no one into his communion, who did not expressly recognize that that communion is the One Catholic Church. But no one could possibly sign the Florentine Decree, without making that express recognition; nor can any one doubt that all who signed it believed this doctrine in their heart. All which can be objected is, that some of them did not *realize* it, whether in itself or in its consequences. Now, as a Catholic writer has truly observed, almost all non-Catholics before their conversion (and he might have added converts some little time after it) are more or less misty and confused in their theology. It is by their admission into the Church, that such mistiness is gradually removed.

There is one circumstance, indeed, in the above narrative, which on the surface presents difficulty: for on June 26th, the two Eastern delegates, who went to the Pope, told him that they had waived further resistance to the Decree, from their great desire of union (see p. 519). This, then, might at first be taken as implying, that they did not fully hold what they were about to subscribe. The difficulty, however, is most easily removed. The two points they now waived were these. (1.) They had claimed that the Pope should never assemble an Œcumenical Council, without seeking the assent of Emperor and Patriarchs; though the refusal of these to come was not to prevent the council from being held.\* (2.) They had claimed that no patriarch should be summoned to Rome for judgment; but that the Pope should send inquisitors to the patriarchate. Now, no one can possibly say that these claims constituted any doctrinal statement. The Easterns had urged certain disciplinary concessions; the Pope had refused them: and the two

---

\* We have given what seems the meaning of the Greek, which is not, however, extremely intelligible. It runs thus:—"ἵνα μὴ συναθροίζῃ σύνοδον οἰκουμένην ἀνεν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῶν πατριαρχῶν· εἰ δὲ μνησθῶσι καὶ οὐκ ἔλθωσιν, ἵνα μὴ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπομείνῃ ἡ σύνοδος." We take the word "ἀπομείνῃ" to mean, "should not remain in abeyance," "should not wait for them."

now tell the Pope, that they waive all further argument for these concessions, in their desire to get home again. What could Eugenius do, other than he did? He thanked them for their zeal; and promised that the Union should take place as soon as possible.

There is every reason to suppose that in this, as in all similar instances, there was a certain proportion of bishops, who were clear-headed in grasping whatever doctrine they speculatively accepted; but that the majority did *not* possess this quality. On one side Mark of Ephesus; on the other side those three bishops, who told the Emperor that they would unite even without him;—were such clear-headed men; and there were probably several others. But clear-headed or puzzle-headed, there can be no possible doubt that, after the Provincial's first oration, all the Easterns present, except the Emperor, accepted vaguely and generally the Pope's divinely-given supremacy, and the obligation consequently incumbent on them of submitting to his authority. That confidence in their own theology, with which they had started, had been rudely and utterly overthrown by their prostrating discomfiture in the discussions on the Double Procession and on the addition to the Symbol; and they were now, accordingly, very much disposed to accept all Roman doctrine. Then came the Provincial's *second* speech; then the three days of busy investigation over their books; and lastly Cardinal Julian's arguments, urged in more private conference. How is it possible to doubt, that during the whole of this time the definiteness and depth of their conviction was constantly on the increase?

That the Emperor was far more misty in his views than any one else, was only to be expected. If emperors choose to assume spiritual authority, they must pay the penalty by making fools of themselves. But even he cannot have been so thick as to doubt that, in signing the Decree, he admitted a command to have been imposed on him by Christ, of submitting in spirituals to the Papal authority. And this was all on which the Pope was obliged to insist.

We are now to consider other objections which have been derived from the Florentine Council, whether against our second thesis by Gallicans, or against both our theses by Anglican Unionists. And first, a difficulty has been suggested in behalf of the Unionists by a Catholic writer, which we do not think he has himself satisfactorily solved. "How is it, if the Greeks were held to be schismatics, that they were placed so honourably in the assembly, and counted as an integral portion of an Œcumenical Council?" He replies, because they were



not held to be formal schismatics ; and he adds, that they were never required to consider themselves as having been such. But we cannot admit this solution as satisfactory. A schismatic is formally such, when his ignorance is not invincible. But to judge of this or that man, that his ignorance is or is not invincible,—is a pretension which not only the Church has never made, but which she has always expressly disclaimed. Her demeanour towards schismatics then could never be affected, by the invincibleness, or otherwise, of their ignorance.

But let us consider what was the ecclesiastical society, whose chief rulers and representatives were assembled at Ferrara and Florence. She was the lineal descendant of that illustrious Eastern Church—the inheritor without rival of those august patriarchates—which had taken so prominent and so glorious a part in the Church's history ; she possessed true sacraments and a true priesthood ; she imparted Christ's Body and Blood with real spiritual fruit, to those among her people who were invincibly ignorant of the Pope's prerogatives, and were otherwise free from mortal sin ; she had preserved orthodox doctrine, in almost every particular, pure and undefiled ; and now (as appeared) she was animated by an eager wish, of once more submitting herself to "Christ's true vicegerent." No demeanour towards such body would be too deferential, too affectionate, so long as the great doctrines of ecclesiastical unity and Papal supremacy were neither compromised nor obscured. It would have been truly strange, then, had they been treated with less signal demonstrations of honour and of welcome, than were in fact exhibited. Moreover, the distinguished places, assigned to them in the assembly, no more proved that the Pope considered them true members of the Council,—than the still more distinguished place, assigned to the Emperor, establishes a similar conclusion in respect to *him*.

However, the Unionists may fairly expect a plain answer to the plain question ; whether, according to Roman doctrine, we can consider the Greek bishops as having formed an integral portion of the Council. We are not aware that any of our theologians have distinctly treated this question ; but we will give that answer which commends itself to our best judgment, as accordant with Catholic principles. And first, it is certain from those principles, that the Council was Œcumenical,—not because the Greeks were present,—but on grounds altogether different. "Œcumenical Councils," says Benedict XIV.,\* "are those to which the bishops of the whole world are called,—who may, and [indeed] ought to be present thereat, unless legiti-

\* Quoted by Dr. Murray, *de Ecclesia*, vol. iii. p. 182.

mately hindered,—and over which the Roman Pontiff presides either himself or by his legates:”—where, of course, by the word, “bishops” he means “bishops in communion with Rome.” Further, it seems equally certain on Catholic principles, that the Greeks were not (at first) even members of the Council, in the *strictest sense of that word*.\* For to be members thereof in the strictest sense would imply, that they sat in the Council as *true judges of doctrine*; and this neither Ultramontane nor Gallican can possibly admit. On the other hand, we may suppose a Greek bishop to arrive at a firm conviction, that the Church in communion with Rome is the Catholic Church, and that the doctrine taught by her is therefore divine. We have seen this, even before the final conferences, in the case of Joseph the Patriarch; and also of the three, who professed their resolution of uniting though without the Emperor. We conceive that, from the moment when they thus believed with divine faith, they became true Catholic bishops and members of the Council in the strictest sense. Consequently when the Decree was signed, every bishop at Florence, except only Mark of Ephesus, was a Catholic bishop.

The question then, asked by Unionists, resolves itself into this. What precise position did the Eastern bishops hold, in a Roman Catholic’s view, during the earlier sessions and debates? If a Roman Catholic cannot regard them as having then been in a strict sense Catholics, he must be much further, nevertheless, from regarding them, as having then been in any strict sense (even materially) schismatics. Let us suppose in our own times that some baptized Protestant spoke thus to a Catholic bishop: “I confidently expect that, through joint examination and by mutual explanation, I shall be able to unite with you on the basis of religious truth: there is nothing which I so ardently desire as this, and I shall account no pains too great for its achievement.” All Roman Catholics, we think, would say that such a man, supposing him of course to be really so minded, is much further from being (even materially) a schismatic, than from being a Catholic; that he has advanced, as it were, three-quarters of the way from schism to unity. Now this was the spirit in which the Greeks professedly came to Ferrara. Nothing was further from their mind, than the Unionist and Indifferentist habit of compromising essential differences for the sake of unity; the research of *truth* was to be the one means of bringing about the contemplated union. This is abundantly evinced in the speech, addressed by Bessarion to the Council,

\* See Dr. Murray, pp. 155, 156.

at the opening of its public sessions. We will give two extracts, taken from the Greek Acts; but the Latin are in close agreement.

For we have come together on both sides with the same aim and eager desire : *leaving no room for anxiety as to whether we conquer or are conquered* ; for such anxiety would not be suitable to Christ's disciples and sober-minded men ; but rather to such as are contentious and self-indulgent. *We desire only to find the Truth* : in company with Truth, we welcome defeat ; apart from Truth, we reject victory. So that it is now urgently important that Truth shall be publicly proclaimed, and shall overcome those things which vainly impede it, and shall dwell in the souls of all . . .

Oh Holy Ghost, the Fountain of spiritual gifts, the Spirit of wisdom, the Spirit of understanding, the Spirit of God's fear, *concerning Whom*, and with Whose aid, the coming contest between the Churches is [to be] carried on, banish from us every proud thought ; infuse the fear of God into the minds of us all ; bestow on us prudence and wisdom ; and [presiding over] that contest which is carried on *concerning Thyself*, make manifest the Truth to all, as being and being called the Spirit of Truth.

We wish we had room to translate a far larger part of this most beautiful oration : but the above will suffice to illustrate our statement. The view then reasonably taken by a Roman Catholic of these Easterns would, we think, be such as this. Here was a number of bishops, professing, and with every appearance of sincerity, a desire profoundly Catholic ; a desire most extremely removed from the schismatical temper ; a desire of cementing unity by submission to Truth. By the Pope's urgent invitation, they attended an Œcumenical Council, which was summoned for the express purpose of receiving and conferring with them. They debated in that Council with most perfect freedom, under the Pope's presidency ; and were brought by every debate nearer to Apostolic doctrine. "They have come joyfully," says Eugenius, in his Decree of Union, "*to this sacred Œcumenical Council*, from a desire of a most sacred union . . . . . Latins and Greeks meeting together *in this sacred and holy Œcumenical Council* have used great zeal and mutual argument, in order that " Truth " should be discussed with the greatest possible care and with assiduous inquiry." In every sense, then, except the very strictest, they were members of the Council : in that very strictest sense, they were *not* ; because no Roman Catholic can admit, that they sat there as divinely appointed judges of doctrine.

It will be objected, that they considered *themselves* to be members of the Council in quite as strict a sense as the Latins were ; and that the Pope took no means to disabuse them of that impression. We most thoroughly admit this, and see no

difficulty whatever in the admission. As we have urged in our earlier article, the Church lies under two divergent obligations. It is her indispensable duty to maintain inflexibly the Deposit of Faith; but she is also bound to labour earnestly, in drawing the greatest possible multitude into the fold of unity and truth: she must so, therefore, pursue the former end, as least to interfere with the latter. It is precisely because of these two divergent obligations, that she incurs reproach so violently inconsistent with itself; that she is stigmatized at one moment as narrow and bigoted, and the next moment as supple and insincere. Now what injury to truth can one even imagine as having resulted, from the prudent economy which she exercised towards the Greeks? Let us suppose that she had acted otherwise; that she had refused even to parley with them on equal terms; that she had required them at starting, by the very ceremonial of the Council, to confess themselves external to the Catholic Church. Of course all hope of union would have been nipped in the bud; and there was every reason to expect that, by her so acting, unspeakable injury would be inflicted on millions of souls as yet unborn. The course, then pursued, was above all things in accordance with Christian charity: who can mention one single particular, whereon it was injurious to Christian faith?

We pass to another matter. It has been objected by an Unionist writer (*Union Review*, of Sept. 1865, pp. 570-2), that Eugenius called the Greek bishops "brethren;" that he enlarged to them on "the hope of union;" "the holy object of union;" "the heavenly work of union;" "the blessings which would result from union;" "the rejoicings which would [thereby] come to the angels in heaven." All these expressions are alleged as difficulties, against the doctrine held by all Roman Catholics; viz., that the Easterns at this time were not Catholics at all. Certainly we are at our wits' end to imagine,—not how such "difficulties" can be answered,—but how any one can possibly regard them as difficulties to us at all.

There is one expression, however, recorded by the Greek narrators, as occurring more than once in the same speech of Eugenius, which no doubt greatly surprises a Roman Catholic. For the Holy Father is represented, as heartily desiring "*to unite the Church of God.*" We utterly disbelieve that he ever used such an expression; as we shall immediately see. But granting, for argument's sake, that he did use it, our opponent must admit, quite as unreservedly as we maintain, that the Pope used the word "Church of God" in a general sense, synonymous with "Christendom." The Anglican Unionists are undoubtedly among the most unreasonable and misty arguers,

with whom we were ever brought into contact. But even they will not venture to allege that Eugenius IV. held a tenet, which would be accounted by the school of Bossuet, quite as emphatically as by the school of Bellarmine, to be among the most fundamentally pernicious of possible heresies: we mean of course the tenet, that the Visible Church can possibly be divided, and so capable of re-union.

We are quite confident, however, that Eugenius never used the expression at all: and that for three reasons. That a Pope, in addressing those whom he accounts non-Catholic, should use so definite a phrase as "the Church of God" in so vague and indefinite a sense, is among the most improbable of suppositions. Now the Reviewer admits that the phrase occurs, not in a written paper, but in a spoken oration; and further, that the said oration, spoken in Latin, was translated on the spot into that Greek which he cites. The whole evidence, then, for the words in question, is this; that they occur in a translation, jotted down hurriedly by an interpreter, before short-hand had ever been heard of, while a speech was being delivered in a foreign language. It would be wanton barbarity to hang a dog on such testimony. Then, secondly, our opponent himself tells us, that "as the Pope spoke, his words were translated into Greek by an interpreter, and *taken down by the secretaries of East and West on the spot.*" The Latin secretary then had far the easier task of the two: for he had only to take down words from the speaker; whereas in the other case first came the interpreter's work, and then the secretary's. We are surprised that, under such circumstances, our opponent never thought of referring to the *Latin Acts*; for there also a speech occurs which,—as is most evident from the context, and from every accompanying circumstance,—is intended for the same. It stands just after the 22nd conference. Now, in this Latin speech, there is not the most distant approach to such an expression as we are now discussing. Lastly, the Decree of Union is, of course, a written document; and we may most thoroughly trust the accuracy, not only of its substance but of its every word. This Decree in many respects reminds the reader of Eugenius's earlier oration quoted in the *Union Review*. As in the latter he ends with saying that the proposed Union "will cause great joy in heaven and in earth,"—so the Decree begins, "let the heavens rejoice, and the earth exult." In the Decree, again, as in the oration, he does not hesitate to speak of the Eastern "Church," even when referring to its former schismatical state. But whereas the oration, reported in the Greek Acts, speaks of "uniting the Church of God," the Decree uses an expression strikingly

different: "let mother Church rejoice," he says, "who sees *her children*—[who had been] hitherto at variance with each other—returning to union and peace." Baptized schismatics are of course the Church's children, though rebellious; and the Church rejoices, not that *she* is re-united (as though she could, even by possibility, have been divided), but that *her children* have returned to mutual amity and concord.

This will be a good opportunity for making one remark, which is of some little importance to students of the Florentine Council. The Greek and Latin Acts are in remarkable agreement, on substantial matters; on the general order of proceedings; on the tenets advocated respectively by West and East; on the arguments adduced by either side; on the mutual attitude of the two convening parties. But the discrepancy of these Acts in matters of detail, is no less remarkable than their agreement in essentials. Thus, as to Eugenius's address, cited in the *Union Review*: nothing can be more certain (as we have said), from context and circumstances, than that the Latin oration which we mentioned is the Latin version of that identical address; and its general scope in either version is precisely the same. But if any one has a vague expectation that there will be some such resemblance between the two, as there is, for instance, between the *Times* and the *Herald* report of a Parliamentary debate,—he will be very effectually undeceived by their perusal. In no documents, we believe, except those actually *written*—as, e.g., Bessarion's opening speech, from which we made a few extracts above—will any such close similarity be discovered. Even as to date, there is often a somewhat perplexing discrepancy; and the obvious inference is, that, while we may trust thoroughly the theological or historical drift and bearing, both of the Greek and of the Latin narrative, we cannot in reason attach much weight to individual statements and expressions. This remark, of course, applies in very different degrees, according to the particular circumstances of each case; according to the greater or less degree, in which it is probable that the writer would have accurately apprehended and remembered what he recounts.

The various objections, hitherto recited, appear to us weak in the extreme. But there is one passage in the Greek Acts, on which Bossuet lays emphatic stress, which we are greatly surprised not to have seen brought forward by some Anglican Unionist. For though the argument, founded on it, in Bossuet's mouth is simply suicidal; in the mouth of an Anglican Unionist, it would be most cogent. Lord Macaulay speaks somewhere of an author, who has used two kinds of controver-



sial artillery: one kind consists of pieces which will not go off at all; the other of pieces which go off with a vengeance, since they recoil with fatal effect on him who employs them. Bossuet, in his whole treatment of the Florentine Council, reminds us of this criticism. The words which we are about to quote, and on which he lays the greatest stress, would undoubtedly (if his view of them were correct) overthrow Ultramontaniam altogether; there being only this attendant disadvantage, that they would quite as crushingly prostrate Gallicanism by the same shock. The following narrative, then, is contained in the Greek Acts (after Session 25):—On Easter Friday the Emperor conferred with his bishops, and resolved on a message to the Pope that they would debate no more. ‘The Latins,’ they said in effect, ‘have always plenty of replies, and there is no end of it. If there is any other path to Union, let us hear of such a path: as to our doctrines, they have been received from the tradition of our fathers, and we are contented with them.’ This message, no doubt, was really the Emperor’s; who (as we have already seen) was throughout far more averse to Union, than the body of his bishops; and, indeed, what immediately followed shows, how little the message can be taken as representing *their* opinions. It is not, however, on this message that Bossuet’s argument turns, but on the Pope’s reply. It was brought back by the two bishops who had carried him the message; and it is reported as follows. We put into italics the part on which Bossuet relies.

For my part, as you see yourselves, I have zealously laboured for this work of the union of the Churches, and still I neglect nothing [I can do]: but you from the beginning have been careless and dilatory; nay (what is worse) you do not even come together for disputation, as we had on both sides agreed to do. However, I propose this to the most serene Emperor, and to my brother the Patriarch, and to the whole Eastern Church. There are four things desired at your hands. First, if you are contented by that clearest and distinct proof which we have exhibited from the Scriptures, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, well: but if not, tell us wherein you doubt, and why you do not receive this doctrine; in order that we may remedy the defect, and establish evidently and distinctly that His Procession is really from the Son. Secondly, if you have authorities from the Holy Scriptures speaking in an opposite sense, that you will show them to us. Thirdly, if you have strong passages of the Scriptures, establishing that what you hold is better and more pious than our doctrine, [adduce them]. Fourthly, if you will do none of these things, let there be a meeting; let the priest say mass; let us swear, Latins alike and Greeks, and let the truth be openly spoken under sanction of an oath: and *whatever shall appear good to the*

*majority (τοῖς πλείοσι), let this be accepted among you and among us.* For an oath among Christians is not deceitfully sworn.

We will add what immediately follows in the Acts: firstly, as throwing light on the Eastern state of mind; and secondly, as enabling us the better to appreciate Bossuet's argument.

When we heard this answer brought back by those who had been sent, we looked into each other's faces, and finding the whole incontrovertible, we said: "We have nothing to answer. As to the first, there are Saints who say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son. What possible doubt of this can we allege? As to the second, are there any Saints who contradict those who say this? We cannot profess that Saints contradict each other. As to the third, how can we establish that our doctrine is better and more pious than that of the Latins? For ours, indeed, is pious, as having been handed down by our fathers; but their doctrine again is not less pious, for there are holy fathers who say this also. As to the fourth, that we should swear by Christ's Precious Body and Blood—what other synod ever did this, that we should do it? Neither does this admit of any reply."

Then Dorotheus himself urged immediate union, on the Pope's terms; "and no one spoke against him nor answered." The Emperor, however, sent back a second message to the Pope, resembling the former in its purport.

Now then for Bossuet's argument. "See," he says in effect, "the Pope himself admits, that not on the Pope himself, but on the Council's vote by a majority, depends the Church's infallible judgment." Nothing, as we said at starting, can be more suicidal than this, as coming from Bossuet. For (1) as Orsi crushingly replies, the doctrine in question—the Double Procession—had already been defined by a Council, admitted by Bossuet himself to be Œcumenical; the second Council of Lyons. If Eugenius, then, had really meant that the question was still an open one,—that it was still dependent for its determination on a Florentine majority,—he would have denied, not merely the infallibility of Popes, but quite as emphatically that of Œcumenical Councils. Moreover (2) on such a supposition, he must have intended to say that a body of bishops, external to the Roman Communion altogether, sat in a Council as true judges of doctrine: a notion, which Bossuet himself would have regarded as simply and fundamentally heretical.

But this very circumstance, which makes the argument so monstrous as coming from Bossuet, adapts it singularly to the purpose of an Anglican Unionist; nor do we see any possible answer available to a Roman Catholic—whether he follow Bossuet or Bellarmine in his theological views—except one

which we trust conclusively to make good. We maintain that the Pope never used these particular words at all.

We have already dwelt on the circumstance, how little trust can be reposed in any isolated statement which the Acts may contain, where such statement rests on no documentary evidence accessible to the writer. If ever there were such a statement, it is this: two bishops received from the Pope a verbal message; they reported that message verbally to their brethren; and Dorotheus wrote down his own remembrance of its purport. The statement, again, is emphatically individual and isolated. Throughout the whole Council (we believe) there was never the slightest mention, either before or after this date, of the very idea, that a final decision could be obtained by majority of votes. The Greeks, perhaps, before arriving at Ferrara, had expected some such rule of decision; \* but it was never mentioned in the Council itself. The *disputations* undoubtedly took place at public sessions of the Council; but the mode universally adopted for arriving at a *decision* was, that some paper was drawn up separately by the Latins, and proposed separately to the Greeks for their acceptance. A very few days after the scene which we have reported, Cardinal Julian attended on the Emperor, to urge orally the Pope's proposal.† The Emperor made the very same objection as before. The Cardinal urged one thing, and one thing alone; viz., that the disputations should continue. "It is *necessary*," he said, "that the disputations continue until the truth shall be discovered; but *it is not possible* to find any other method of union." The method of union, then, through majority of votes, was quite unknown to him.

We have no means in this particular case of correcting the Greek by the Latin Acts, because the latter are wholly silent (as is very natural) on a private communication between the Pope and the Easterns. But the Greek narrative is on the surface very suspicious on four different grounds. Firstly, Eugenius begins his speech (as was of course to be expected) by expressing unbounded confidence in the dogma of the Double Procession; but he ends it by declaring his readiness to abandon that doctrine, if he is outvoted. Secondly, he speaks throughout of *Scripture* as being the one standard, to which

\* Just before the First Session there is this passage in the Greek Acts:—"We, dreading the vote and judgment of the *majority*, feared lest the majority of votes should prevail against us, according to the law of voting; but this [difficulty also] was resolved by" the Latins. We do not profess to understand these last words.

† Reported in the Greek Acts, shortly after Bessarion's long speech to his countrymen in behalf of union.

the disputations had appealed: whereas the most cursory perusal of these disputations will show that, though the Scripture question was no doubt carefully treated, yet the main stress of the argument rested on *the Fathers*. In fact, when the disputations were renewed in a more private shape, the delegates at once began, not with a text of Scripture, but with a passage of S. Maximus. Then, thirdly, while the Pope's speech, as reported, represents the controversy as having turned wholly on Scripture, the bishops in reply, as *they* are reported, speak as though it had turned wholly on the Fathers. This will be evident to any one who reads the passages which we quoted above. And lastly, the fourth alternative reported as coming from the Pope, speaks,—subordinately indeed of an oath,—but prominently of a decision by majority of votes; whereas the Eastern answer makes no mention ever so distantly of the latter, and deals exclusively with the proposed oath.

The evidence, then, accruing from the Acts, for the genuineness of Eugenius's speech in this particular, must be ranked by all candid inquirers as among the slightest; whereas a reasonable man could hardly be convinced of such genuineness, even by the strongest. Let us briefly consider its wild improbability. Popes, no doubt, in the first seven or eight centuries, had again and again permitted to councils a full discussion of doctrines already ruled *ex cathedrâ* by themselves: but what single instance (apart from this one) has ever been adduced, by Catholic, by Protestant, by Infidel, in which any Pope has promised beforehand to acquiesce in a vote of the majority? Did S. Celestine tell the Ephesian Fathers, that he would withdraw his condemnation of Nestorius if they should absolve that heretic? Did S. Leo make such a promise to the Council of Chalcedon? Yet such a promise would be quite commonplace and ordinary, as compared with that here ascribed to Eugenius IV.; for a number of bishops were to vote, not only who were external to the Pope's communion, but who avowed a tenet, already condemned in a Council which he regarded as *Œcumenical*. To imagine a parallel, we must suppose that S. Celestine had convoked another council after that of Ephesus, in order to confer with certain Nestorians who desired further light; and that he promised these latter to embrace Nestorianism himself, should the majority of the new council thus determine.

And who is the Pope reported to have made so strange an engagement? One who at this very moment was at violent issue with the pseudo-Council of Basle, because they denied the Pope's supremacy over an *Œcumenical* Council.

We almost owe our readers an apology for arguing further, on a matter which is really so manifest; yet we must not lightly put aside a statement, which has been accepted by Orsi and De Maistre, no less than by Bossuet. Let us proceed then to point out, how completely at variance it is with the Pope's whole attitude throughout the Council. We will mention two most prominent illustrations of this. What had been the one thesis, urged consistently by the Westerns, on the addition of "*Filioque*" to the Symbol? That the words had been rightly added, *because added by an infallible authority*: yet Eugenius is here reported to have so completely abandoned this allegation of infallibility, that he declared his hypothetical readiness to abandon the dogma itself of the Double Procession. Passing from the earlier to the later sessions, he claimed—and required the Easterns to accept his claim as a necessary preliminary of union—to be by divine right "the teacher of Christians." How could he with a grave face put forth such a claim, if but a few weeks before he had offered to surrender his supremacy of teaching, to the accidental majority of a council? And how can any one suppose, that so glaring an inconsistency should not have struck the Easterns, and been thrown by them in his teeth? Orsi, indeed, well points out the curious inconsistency of Bossuet's language about Eugenius. The French prelate represents him as on one occasion offering a concession, which to Bossuet himself must appear monstrous; and then, as within a few weeks, claiming for his See an absolute and intolerable supremacy, such as the Eastern bishops peremptorily refused to admit.

It may be asked, what is our own suggestion as to the real answer returned by Eugenius. We express an opinion with the greatest diffidence; but the following has struck us, as having possibly been his proposal. He may have suggested that each bishop present, whether Latin or Greek, should at once express his opinion, under the sanction of an oath. He must have been aware that the Greek bishops were far more disposed for Union than their Emperor; and he may have thought it an important gain, that the latter should come to know what root had been taken among them by Latin ideas. Nor would it be at all unnatural that the two Easterns should have fancied such a proposal to imply—though of course it could not have implied—that a majority of votes should determine the opinion of all.

The only remaining procedure of the Council (so far as we know), which can possibly be wrested by the Unionists to their purpose, is the decision on Purgatory. We are not

aware, indeed, that they *have* alleged this decision; but they might imaginably argue thus:—"The Latin Church held, as a most certain dogma, that purgatorial suffering is by fire; yet they did not attempt to make this belief a condition of union. It may be inferred from this, that the Roman Catholic Church did not claim to be the One Catholic Church, whose dogma was to be received on her infallible authority; but that she negotiated union with the Easterns, on some common basis, to which both parties might freely consent." Before directly encountering such an argument, (if indeed any one should think of urging it,) we will answer it indirectly by a *reductio ad absurdum*. No one will say that the Council of Trent was occupied with arranging, on equal terms, an union between "the two independent societies of East and West;" and yet the Council of Trent made a doctrinal concession in favour of the Easterns, to which no parallel, even the most distant, can possibly be alleged from the Council of Florence. And we are the rather disposed to dwell on this concession, because it throws much light on several principles, which we have been from time to time discussing in this Review. We are referring to the decree on divorce; and we refer for a full account of the facts, to Perrone's most useful work "on Christian Matrimony," vol. iii., p. 407, *et seq.* The Council was on the point of branding with an anathema the tenet, that marriage is dissolved by adultery. It was suggested, however, by the Venetians, that great offence would probably be taken at this by those Orientals in communion with Rome, who abode whether in East or West, and who practised the very custom in question. The canon was consequently changed into its present form: "If any one shall have said that the Church errs, when she has taught and teaches, according to evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved because of the adultery of either party, . . . let him be anathema." And though it is difficult, at first sight, to see the difference of purport between this and the form originally proposed, Perrone explains it clearly enough.

The Eastern Christians are characterized by nothing more conspicuously, than by a certain sluggishness and stationariness of religious thought; a tendency to proceed, without theory and without reflection, in their fathers' way, simply because it *has been* their fathers'. Nothing then would be more natural, than that many united Greeks should continue this practice of divorce which they had hereditarily received, without therein intending to censure the Roman Catholic Church, or to criticise her doctrine at all. By this new canon, their practical view of the case was not directly anathematized: those only



were anathematized who, like Lutherans and Calvinists, expressly spoke against the Church's teaching. Ever since the confirmation of this canon, "whoever accuses the Church of error in this particular is a *heretic*, and incurs an anathema; but he who teaches a *contrary doctrine* [without however expressly accusing the Church of error] is plunged [not strictly in *heresy*, but] at least in an error bordering on heresy."—(Perrone, p. 415.) Or, in other words, the tenet that marriage is dissolved by adultery, has been infallibly condemned by the Church: yet it has not been condemned by her as actually *heretical*, but as unsound in some lower degree. The ascribing, however, of *error* to this infallible condemnation, *has* been proscribed as directly heretical.

From this an important consequence follows, to which, however, Perrone does not expressly refer. Suppose you disbelieve (e. g.) the doctrine of Transubstantiation, though you well know that it is taught by the Church in communion with Rome. However invincible may be your ignorance of that Church's authority—and however convinced a priest may be of such invincibility—he cannot admit you to the sacraments. But suppose that, through invincible ignorance, you disbelieve some doctrine, which is infallibly taught indeed by the Church, yet not as strictly of *faith*:—the priest then is *not* bound to exclude you. Consequently those Easterns in communion with Rome, who hold that adultery dissolves marriage, and whose ignorance of the contradictory truth may be presumed invincible, are admissible to the sacraments; which they would not have been, had the canon remained in its original shape. And this is just one of those instances, on which we have spoken more than once in this and in our earlier article, where the Church aims at so enforcing truth, as least to interfere with the salvation of souls. There is no possible danger that the Easterns can corrupt the true dogma; for the Church by her discipline guards successfully against any such possibility. And, at the same time, their position is far more hopeful, than if they had been required to choose explicitly, between an abandonment on the one hand of their traditional error, and a forfeiture on the other hand of all communion with Rome.

No one can possibly allege, that any concession on Purgatory was made to the Greeks at Florence, which even distantly approaches to this. But in point of fact no concession was made at all. It is true that the Western theologians of that period unanimously held, as certain, the doctrine of purgatorial *fire*, strictly so-called; but the certainty, which they ascribed to that doctrine, was only (to use Suarez's expression) "within

the latitude of theological opinion.”\* We believe no single writer can be named, who advocated the existence of that fire as being in such sense certain, as that its denial is theologically unsound.† And as to the Westerns in general, there was most undoubtedly a living tradition among them, that this was no question on which their opinion could legitimately be enforced on the Greeks as a condition of union. The profession of faith to which we have already referred, drawn up in the year 1267 by Pope Clement IV. stated the doctrine of Purgatory almost in the very words afterwards adopted at Florence. And at Florence the Westerns made no attempt whatever to introduce any mention of *fire*; on the contrary, they offered to the Greeks the definition, almost word for word as it now stands, as expressing “the faith of the Roman Church concerning the truth of Purgatory” (Latin Acts).

Indeed, on the very opening of the first private conferences, the difference of the two views was found in principle comparatively trifling. “This, therefore,” say the Greek Acts, “was the difference between them. The Greeks assert *chastisement*, and *grief*, and a *place* of chastisement; but not by means of fire: whereas the Italians assert chastisement, and purgation, by means of fire.” It is probable enough, indeed, that the prevalent belief among Easterns, on the *severity* of purgatorial punishment, was considerably short of that which the Church practically teaches; but the one most hopeful course for imbuing them with that full doctrine, was the accomplishment of Union. There was every reason to expect, that thence would result a constantly increasing communication between East and West, and a constantly increasing infusion of Latin ideas into the Eastern mind. But as to any kind of objection or protest raised by Greeks against the Latin practical system—such a protest, *e.g.*, as is raised against it by Dr. Pusey,—we have been unable to find, either in the Greek or Latin Acts, the slightest hint, the remotest trace, of any such phenomenon.

We think that, on the whole, a candid study of the Florentine Acts, both Greek and Latin, will lead to the following conclusions, on the respective attitude of the two convening parties. The Easterns arrived at Ferrara with an extremely strong conviction, not merely that the addition to the Symbol was most unwarrantable, but that the dogma which it expressed

---

\* In 3 m., d. 46, s. 2.

† Our authority for this statement is a friend extremely well acquainted with mediæval scholastics, who in vain attempted to find in any of them this latter opinion.

was utterly false and even heretical. On the constitution of the Church, they had no definite theory whatever, which could admit of being scientifically stated. They were, however, fully convinced that they were true members of the Church, though separated from Papal communion; and they undoubtedly held that an Œcumenical Council is infallible. On the other matters at issue, they seem to have had no very decided conviction; except of course that their own use of leavened bread in the Eucharist did not interfere with the validity of the sacrament.\* To their unspeakable surprise, as the debates proceeded, they felt more and more that they were wholly unable to contend against the Latins, on those very points which they had regarded as their stronghold; and this circumstance inspired them with a deep distrust of their own theology, and a great readiness to accept the Latin Creed on other matters also. Consequently, as soon as an agreement was obtained on the Double Procession, the main difficulty was at an end.† From that moment the Emperor was the only remaining obstacle; and Easterns combined with Westerns, in labouring to remove prejudice from his mind, and bring the truth home to his apprehension.

As to the Westerns, we do not see how a second opinion is possible on the position which they consistently maintained. On every single point at issue, their view, from the first, was precise, definite, and stable. On the Pope's prerogatives, in particular, they held, not merely that communion with him is necessary to salvation (though this, of course, was *included* in their doctrine); but also, that his power is, in no respect, limited or circumscribed by any human authority; that he is the one source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; the one infallible teacher of Divine Truth. To this doctrine the Easterns finally acceded; and such is the true and germane sense of that definition, which originated with the Westerns substantially as it now stands, and to which Latins and Greeks alike subscribed.

---

\* "Concerning Purgatory and the consecration of the gifts [the Easterns resolved] to say nothing whatever about them—not knowing, as I think, the true determination of the matter."—Greek Acts, soon after recording the Patriarch's death.

† On June the 8th, when this agreement was finally consummated, [the Latins] "rose and kissed us, and there was great joy on both sides."—Greek Acts.

## Notices of Books.

---

*On the Management of Prisoners.* A Paper read at the Academia of the Catholic Religion. By the Right Rev. Bishop ULLATHORNE. London : Richardsons. 1866.

IT is very seldom that we are able to speak of any work in terms of such high and unqualified praise, as we can most unaffectedly bestow upon the Bishop of Birmingham's most interesting and masterly essay on the management of criminals. The subject of it is one of extreme and pressing importance, and the bishop is probably the man of all others in England the most competent to deal with it. He is not only familiar with all its bearings as a matter of theory, but has enjoyed abundant opportunities of estimating the effect of various systems in the course of his experience as a colonial missionary. To these qualifications he adds those of an accurate thinker and a powerful writer ; and above all is able to treat the subject, as so few men of equal ability and experience are able to treat it, in the light of true religion and of the Catholic Church. There are, of course, men of political knowledge and experience who might have dealt with the merely economic side of the subject as fully as the bishop. There are also Catholics who, by force of instinct, if not as the result of a reasoning process, have long felt the truth of his views, so far as they relate to the religious interests of convicts ; but we can think of no Englishman who combines these different conditions in the same excellence as the Bishop of Birmingham. We earnestly hope, and can hardly doubt, that his pamphlet will find its way to the library-tables of Mr. Gladstone, Sir George Grey, Mr. Walpole, and others on both sides of the political world, whose official position requires, or may require, them to look at the subject of prison discipline both in its theoretical and experimental aspects. For we cannot but think that the command of the whole subject which the bishop indicates, must win even reluctant minds (and in this class we by no means wish to include the politicians just mentioned) to feel still more strongly what such men are now beginning to feel, the absolute necessity of, with a view even to their own professional objects, of introducing the light of religion into the moral and spiritual gloom in which our prisoners were long enveloped, and from which they are only now recovering by degrees, and in detached places. But, above all, we trust that the bishop's essay may come extensively under the eyes of the magistracy, who are still too slow to profit by the results of the experiment, admitted to be so successful in the Government prisons, of providing the Catholic convicts with the full advantages of their religion.

In a short notice like the present, we cannot attempt to do justice to a pamphlet at once so comprehensive and so suggestive. The bishop, after

depicting with graphic power the horrors of the old English prison system—the crowding, the shameful intermixture of the sexes, and of the more confirmed with the more inexperienced criminals; the filth, the vice, the brutality of officials, and the ever deepening demoralization of the inmates, with other similar details in the catalogue of abominations—proceeds to show what improvements have been made in recent times under the influence of a more enlightened and humane policy. We speak of the policy which was first exemplified in the benevolent ministrations of Howard and Mrs. Fry, and has been since expressed in the construction and internal arrangements of our more modern prisons. He proves that the methods, tardily adopted in this country, towards the amelioration of some of these evils, are really, even in their very details, of a Catholic origin, and had previously been in operation in Catholic cities. He compares with one another the different systems of prison management at present in vogue, and points out their several defects and capabilities of amendment. He dwells at some length upon the admitted evils of extreme solitude, in favouring habits of vicious thought, and in weakening both the physical and moral energies of those who are exposed to it. We are particularly interested in that portion of his work in which he describes the advantages which a system of regular hours, appointed work, and modified silence and solitude, would furnish towards the reformation of the criminal, supposing that the influences of religion were duly brought to bear upon it. Protestants are apt to say that our monasteries are prisons. We may well retort, that their prisons should be converted into monasteries. As things are, they possess more than all the restraints of religious houses of strict observance, without the religion, which forms the soul of the ascetic system. We imagine that Canon Oakeley must be pleased to find the proofs of coincidence, obviously most undesigned and independent, between much of the bishop's language and that contained in a lecture published by him several years ago on the Catholic religion in its influence on national morality, in which he is led to speak especially, though but incidentally, on the subject of our prison discipline.

Mr. Oakeley says (pp. 11, 12) :—

“The prisoners rise and go to rest like monks, at a fixed time. Their occupations, their meals, their exercise, are all regulated with conventual exactitude. They have their infirmary like the inmates of one of our religious establishments, where every comfort which illness can need, or care supply, is provided for them; but still with one great exception. They have also their ‘associations,’ which require nothing but a religious bond to raise them to confraternities or sodalities. Their keepers, and the officers who attend upon them, never seemed to me to be wanting in personal kindness towards them, or to wish to add to their punishment without absolute necessity. They would occasionally enter the cells (so far like the superiors of a college), not merely for the purpose of keeping a vigilant eye upon the inmates, but in order to relieve the monotony of solitary confinement by a few words of kindly remark. All this, you will agree with me, constitutes, to the life, the machinery and the framework of a Religious house. But it is the body without the soul.”

Within a very recent period, Canon Oakeley has witnessed a favourable change in the prison to which he here alludes; and the total darkness in the

spiritual order which he laments, has been relieved by a ray of light. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is now celebrated at Pentonville prison, as we learn from a paragraph in the Catholic papers, every Sunday and Wednesday.

At Millbank, where the great body of Catholic convicts is assembled, the most complete provision is now made for their spiritual welfare. Mass is said daily, and the Catholic prisoners are assembled at other times for instruction and devotion. The Government likewise provides a Catholic schoolmaster, and has even given an harmonium for the accompaniment of the Catholic hymns. The entire success of this arrangement, under the wise and devoted priest who is appointed to superintend it, has been attested by the published evidence of the authorities to whom this department of the State is committed. All except those who are determined to shut their eyes to all testimony which speaks in favour of the Catholic Church, are now satisfied that men like the Bishops of Birmingham and Southwark, who have for years recommended a complete religious equality between Catholic and Protestant prisoners, as the only effectual means of carrying out the true end of correction and reformatory punishment, are the real benefactors of the civil government.

There can be no greater mistake than that of supposing that the unhappy men who in our convict prisons are paying the protracted penalty of crimes various in degree, and in the amount of moral guilt they presume, are dead or dull to the awakening and soothing accents of religion. Many of them are youths, in the early days of crime, who have not yet forgotten the sweet tones of a mother's voice, or the salutary and parental instruction of their parish priest. Those who know the Irish (and it is the Irish of which the great mass of our Catholic population is composed), know how long their faith will survive the loss of its proper fruits; while, in many cases, a crime which entails the severe penalties of the law, involves a far less aggravated state of moral and spiritual evil, than sins which are habitually committed by men of the world with legal impunity. It is impossible to overrate the effect produced upon the minds, even of the more hardened, and far more of the less experienced criminal, by the ministrations of those who approach them with a tenderness and respectfulness due to their unhappy condition, in the midst of a discipline which, however necessary for coercion and correction, is apt to be administered with hardness, if not with harshness; dealing with men as classes, and making little or no allowance for the real distinctions of character and circumstance which exist among them; but upon this subject we commend to the reader the interesting remarks contained in the excellent pamphlet under review.

---

*A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his Recent Eirenicon.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., of the Oratory. London: Longmans.

THE patristic argument, contained in this pamphlet, constitutes a most valuable addition to Catholic controversial literature. Nor, again can anything be more masterly, than the vindication to our Lady of the well-known passage, Apoc. xii. 1—6 (pp. 57-66). The effect of F. Newman's



reasoning on Anglicans is likely to be very considerable ; and we are really curious to see how Dr. Pusey will attempt to answer it.

F. Newman's defence of Marian devotion includes also more than one beautiful remark, beautifully and touchingly expressed. It contains, however, also various lines of thought, open to great question. We refer, *e. g.*, to his appeal to nationalism by the contrast drawn throughout between English and foreign devotions. We refer also to his proposition (p. 86) that "a people's religion is ever a corrupt religion;" and that "puerile absurdities" are to be found in the religious practices prevalent abroad. Nor can we at all agree with the opinion, if we rightly understand it, that devotion to the Mother of God "has far more connexion with the public services and festive aspect of Christianity, and with certain extraordinary offices which she holds, than *with what is strictly personal and primary in religion*" (p. 98, note).

We regret also F. Newman's language in p. 109, and from p. 118 to p. 121. Had he read in their context the passages cited by Dr. Pusey from S. Alphonsus ; from the Ven. Grignon de Montfort ; and from Salazar's two easily accessible works ; he would have been able to defend those illustrious writers against Dr. Pusey's most unfounded calumny. We hope to do this ourselves in our next number, in a reply to the Eirenicon on the whole subject of Marian devotion.

Lastly, in his criticism of this Review, we must point out that he has curiously misapprehended Dr. Pusey's argument. It would have been strange indeed, if the latter had laid such great stress on opinions expressed in a purely private and unofficial periodical like ours. But Dr. Pusey drew attention, not to the infallibility claimed for the Pope by the DUBLIN REVIEW, but to the infallibility claimed for the Pope *by the Pope himself*. Dr. Pusey only spoke of the DUBLIN REVIEW, as "drawing out" this claim (p. 292), and exhibiting it to the British public. A few extracts from the Eirenicon will abundantly prove this :—

"The writer in the DUBLIN REVIEW has shown that the Encyclical of 1864 does claim this [infallibility] in the name of Pius IX. (p. 289).

"The main principle which Pius IX. appears to have assumed, that he is infallible in all his formal utterances, on whatever subjects connected (in his judgment) with the well-being of the Church (p. 288).

"The doctrine of Papal infallibility, laid down by Bellarmine, is declared in the Encyclical of last year to be inadequate (p. 303).

"This theory [on Papal infallibility] . . . is contained in the Encyclical of 1864 (p. 318).

"On the principle involved in the Encyclical of 1864 and the Syllabus, that historical statements, made by the Pope, are infallible" (p. 331).

Moreover, a very fair and able critic of the Eirenicon, in the *Times* of December 22, 1865, makes the same statement :—

"Nor is there really any pretence for saying that these views are the unauthorized exaggerations of an extreme party. They are the views of the Pope himself. They are the views of all who claim to speak with authority, and to represent the legitimate and prevailing belief. The sympathy and assent of every right-thinking man are taken for granted, without rebuke or protest. It is hard to see what mark of general sanction they want."

What we entreat any one to consider who condemns our views as "extreme," is this. Have we put forth any single claim in the Pope's behalf, *which he has not first put forth in his own?* We protest earnestly, that our one aim in the whole matter has simply been, to discover what the Holy See teaches on its own prerogative, in order that we may state and defend that teaching to the best of our ability.

It is most true, then, quite a truism indeed,—yet surely nothing to the purpose—that the writers in this REVIEW "are in no sense spokesmen for English Catholics." We should be utterly ashamed of ourselves, if so preposterous a notion had ever entered our mind. The "spokesmen for English Catholics" are most undoubtedly the Holy Father and the English Bishops: nor do we think English Catholics at all likely to accredit any others.

---

*The Lady Chapel and Dr. Pusey's Peacemaker.* The Substance of a Sermon preached in S. John's Church, Islington, on the Twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost, 1865. By the REV. FATHER GALLWEY, S.J. Sold for the benefit of poor children. London: Burns & Co.

THIS sermon has already reached a third edition. It is Father Gallwey's great merit as a preacher that he never utters a sentence which does not bear the impression of coming from the heart. The discourse before us, preached at the re-opening of the Lady Chapel at S. John's, Islington, is eminently characteristic of its author, even down to the very title-page. It contains no words *de trop*, no sacrifices of sense to sound, of earnestness to mere rhetoric. It is made up entirely of very short sentences, pithy and pungent. It comprehends the materials of a host of meditations, and the arguments of a whole series of controversies, in almost every page. The idea upon which it proceeds is a happy one. It was preached on the Sunday before Advent, when the Church brings before her children the subject of the final judgment. The preacher supposes a Catholic to be arraigned before the judgment seat by the "Accuser of the brethren," and the ground-work of the charge to be, his devotion to the Mother of God. The argument for the devotion is drawn out in the various points of the Catholic's defence. He pleads in his behalf that in loving and honouring the Blessed Virgin he has but followed the teaching and example of his Saviour; and then disposes, one by one, of the various objections which his accuser ingeniously clothes in the language of the day. We observe that Anglican critics contrast Father Gallwey's sermon with Dr. Newman's and Canon Oakeley's pamphlets, as if it breathed a less charitable spirit. For our own part, we are struck by the essential harmony in this particular respect of the three publications; and observe no other variations between them than such as result from the marked differences between the characters of the several writers; such differences as are always sure to be found, among those who write sincerely, and whose writings are therefore the photographs of their authors.

Not the least characteristic feature in Father Gallwey's publication is the proposal to give the profits for "the benefit of poor children." This is

one more token of his loving zeal in the cause of our orphans. For their sake, as well as for that of the Catholic cause, we rejoice in the encouragement given by the public to this work.

---

*Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church.* By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. London : Longmans.

THIS work will be published very soon after our own number appears. Mr. Allies has kindly forwarded to us the sheets ; and we entreat our readers to study it most carefully. The particular question raised is that which concerns the Church's constitution.

Dr. Pusey speaks of the Church having once been "undivided;" *i. e.* of having once possessed a certain unity, which she has now lost. All Catholics maintain, on the contrary, as an elementary truth—as a doctrine no less infallibly certain than that of the Trinity or the Incarnation—that the Church is indivisible. This is the doctrine which we put most prominently forward in our January article against Dr. Pusey ; and it is with this doctrine that a large portion of Mr. Allies' volume is occupied. This "is the belief," he says, "on which the Church has lived since the day of Pentecost to the present moment. This is the truth which, without exception, every Father held" (p. 33). From p. 78 to p. 109, Mr. Allies draws out an invaluable catena to the same effect, reaching from S. Ignatius Martyr to the great S. Leo. Dr. Pusey must be well aware of these passages ; and yet how has he attempted to meet them ? He has simply ignored their existence. Never, surely, since Christianity began, was there a position so controversially contemptible as that of Anglicans. Dr. Pusey appeals to Christian Antiquity ; whereas, if there is any doctrine in the world which Christian Antiquity testifies explicitly and most emphatically, it is this very doctrine which Dr. Pusey denies. Far more plausible objections may be raised against the patristic evidence for the Trinity or the Incarnation, than against the patristic evidence for the Church's indivisible unity. To profess an appeal to Antiquity, and at the same time to deny the Church's indivisibility, is a delusion or a mockery.

This doctrine, so unanimously and explicitly testified by all the Fathers, was expressed by S. Augustine with especial emphasis, on occasion of the Donatist schism. Mr. Allies' argument, let Dr. Pusey observe, does not turn on what the *Donatists* maintained, but on what *S. Augustine* maintained in his replies to them. From p. 7 to p. 33, Mr. Allies draws out the great Father's various statements ; and concludes with saying, most justly, that "Dr. Pusey's doctrine is the most unpatristic which can be conceived, being the contradiction of that idea on which the Fathers lived."

Now, the Church's indivisible unity is secured by the circumstance, that God has subjected her to one supreme central authority. See pp. 211, 212 of our January number. We have next, therefore, to inquire what is that supreme central authority ? This is the true way of putting the Papal question ; and as soon as it is so put, Dr. Pusey is out of court. He does

not even allege the *existence* of any supreme central authority, other than the Papal. He denies that there is any such authority at all reigning by Divine Right ; and in that denial, he opposes himself as absolutely to the unanimous testimony of the Fathers, as though he denied the Incarnation or Baptismal Regeneration. He may, no doubt, raise historical objections against the doctrine of Papal supremacy ; but if those objections were conclusive, it would follow (as we pointed out in January, p. 238), not that the Anglican society is part of the Catholic Church, but that the Catholic Church has ceased to be. And further, since Christ and His Apostles have emphatically declared that she will never on earth cease to be, such an objection, if valid, would further prove that Christianity is not from God. In refuting, then, Dr. Pusey's historical objections to Papal supremacy, Mr. Allies is really vindicating the Divine origin of Christianity against Dr. Pusey's assault.

Dr. Pusey's one palmary historical objection is the case of Apiarius ; and, in connection with that case, the doctrine of S. Augustine, and of the whole contemporaneous African Church. Nothing more complete can be imagined, than Mr. Allies's reply to this. As to S. Augustine's positive doctrine, Mr. Allies exhibits it in detail, from p. 34 to p. 42 ; and as to the particular case of Apiarius, he discusses it most fully and frankly from p. 69 to p. 80. We do trust that, as a matter of common justice, Dr. Pusey will either reply to Mr. Allies's argument, or else confess himself to have been completely in the wrong.

*Anglo-Romanism Unveiled ; or Canon Oakeley and Dr. Newman at issue with the Catholic and Roman Church, and with one another. A Letter addressed to the Rev. W. J. IRONS, D.D., by A LAYMAN. London : Hayes.*

THIS pamphlet is a very curious result of the "Eirencon." A work ostensibly intended to promote peace, has the effect, if "A Layman" may be taken as a witness, of setting as many people as possible by the ears. We could scarcely have imagined that so great a number of "enmities" could be created out of such materials. Meanwhile, the writer is at variance with Canon Oakeley, and even more with Dr. Newman. He is evidently not altogether at one even with Dr. Pusey ; nor is he wholly satisfied with any party in his own Church, while, of course, he is at issue with the Catholic and Roman. A curious commentary this on a proposal for peace. It is evident that Dr. Pusey should begin at home, and compose the differences which there exist, before he can hope to compass any more comprehensive plan of union. We can only designate this pamphlet as making up in noise what it wants in strength. It is shallow, conceited, and impertinent. But it has its use in throwing light, though without its author's intention, on the controversy to which it relates. For instance, it proves—what many of us have said, and have been blamed for saying—that the anti-Catholic and controversial portion of Dr. Pusey's work is that which predominates in fact, and will be sure to tell in effect, far above its unpractical theories of union. What a large number of his co-religionists want at the present moment is a plausible excuse

for remaining where they are ; and even those among them who are the least favourably inclined towards the Catholic Church will put up with a great deal more of sympathy with her formal decrees, than they themselves feel, if the pill be gilded by a sufficient quantity of invective against her practical teaching. Canon Oakeley's "discernment" in discovering the "hostile and controversial character" of the Eirenicon is said by this writer to be "common to all who have read it." He seems to think (so far with the able critic in the *Month*) that there is not much probability of the Anglican bishops taking part against a work which, after all, contains "so small an amount of concession to Rome" (p. 15). But this writer affords a still more important illustration of the controversy, in justifying, to the letter, the suspicions expressed on our side of a deeply ingrained heresy on the subject of the Incarnation, extending even to the more orthodox members of the Established Church. This heresy is brought to the surface in such passages as the following, and appears to lie at the root of the unwillingness which we observe in many quarters to confront the full meaning of the term *Deipara*.

The Layman says (p. 26)—

"Her relation to her holy Son was never, and could not be, like that of any ordinary mother towards her offspring."

Again (p. 42), writing against Dr. Newman :—

"Mary neither bore, nor suckled, nor handled the Eternal in any form but Christ . . . . Mary is not the 'mother of the Eternal.' The term, 'Mother of God' implies no such (as I hesitate not to say) blasphemy."

Our readers will, as we think, dispense us from the necessity of giving any more extracts from this pamphlet. We really cannot tell what side or party it is meant to defend. Its hand is against every one. Its quotations from the pamphlets which it undertakes to review are singularly inaccurate; so much so, indeed, that we are not disposed to ascribe to any cause but carelessness, omissions which, at first sight, might appear to originate in purposed unfairness. Thus, Canon Oakeley is charged with saying that the blood in the Most Blessed Eucharist is actually that of the Blessed Virgin, and therefore not to be honoured with the worship of *Latria*; whereas he distinctly says that all which was once the Blessed Virgin's, is infinitely exalted in the human nature of our Lord by its union with the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and is now no otherwise hers, than as it was from her that our Lord condescended to take that nature.

---

*The Union Review*, for March, 1866.

THIS number purports to continue a controversy with ourselves on two different matters, which have for some time been at issue between the two Reviews. We can hardly say which is less satisfactory; the brief and evasive reply given on the first, or the long and irrelevant one given on the second.

As regards the former (pp. 239, 240), since there is no attempt to meet any one of our statements, nothing is left for us except briefly to recapitulate them. (1) We pointed out that to claim infallibility for Eugenius's Decree, is no Ultramontane peculiarity, as the Reviewer had alleged; because the

same claim is made for it by Tourneley, quite a representative Gallican (pp. 281, 282). We accidentally omitted to add, that the Pope avowedly promulgated the Decree "sacro hoc approbante Florentino Concilio." (2) We showed that whatever the Decree does mean, it cannot possibly mean that there is no valid Christian ordination anywhere without "tradition of the instruments;" because, beyond all possible question, the same Pope had, within the last three months, recognized the Greek ordinations as valid (pp. 282, 283). (3) We drew out that explanation of the Decree, which to us seemed most probable; which gives it a most obvious and simple sense; and which does not in the least imply the invalidity of other rites, in other times, places, or circumstances (pp. 283, 284). (4) We added, however, that the Pope declared himself to be delivering doctrine "sub quodam brevi compendio," not therefore in detail and at length (p. 283). Instead of replying to any single proposition which we put forth, the Reviewer has objected to one which we did not put forth. We will add, therefore (5), that we neither said, nor thought, that "the document is simply a practical instruction to the Armenians, on those portions of the Latin ritual which differ from their own." We are as far from holding this opinion as our opponent is himself.

Mr. Ffoulkes's reply on the other controverted matter, extends over twenty pages (pp. 188-208); and it cannot therefore be disposed of quite so briefly. Our comment will fall under six different heads.

Firstly, it now appears that Mr. Ffoulkes and the *Union* Reviewer were, from the first, aware of the fact, that the Florentine Decree was drawn up in Latin as well as in Greek. We must say, then, that their controversial tactics were very disingenuous. Their allegation had been, that the Latin Decree now current is not the original, but an unauthorized translation from the Greek, made 150 years afterwards by Caryophilus a Cretan. They well knew from the first, it now appears, that their argument involved the following marvellous assumptions: (1) That whereas the Greek Decree was preserved, the Latin Decree—which in every case had been written on the same paper—was irrecoverably lost: torn off, we suppose, and thrown into the fire. (2) That no copy of it whatever had been kept by the Westerns, who had drawn it up. (3) That during 150 years no Decree at all was extant in Latin. (4) That after that time the Latins adopted a translation, unauthorizedly made from the Greek by a certain Cretan. (5) That they were all so taken in on the matter, that on two subsequent occasions a Pope quoted this unauthoritative translation, as the very words of the Florentine Council.\*

Now if our readers will look back to the *Union Review* for last September and November; and if they further peruse a letter addressed by Mr. Ffoulkes to the *Weekly Register* of December 16;—they will find no hint, even the most distant, that there ever existed an original Latin Decree at all. On December 16 a letter appeared, from the present writer, stating this fact; and Mr. Ffoulkes, in reply, of course admitted it. These two controversialists therefore used every possible effort, that their less learned readers should remain wholly ignorant of a fact, which, as soon as stated, must appear to

---

\* See Denzinger, n. 876. "*Quemadmodum etiam, ut eadem Florentina Synodus assertit, in gestis, &c.*"



every ordinary person an unanswerable refutation of their whole argument. The fact is now brought out, and Mr. Ffoulkes is obliged to face it; but he kept it back as long as he possibly could.

Secondly, we will consider the Greek text of the clause in question, on strictly philological grounds; making no reference to the original Latin, or to the history of the Council. On this part of our subject, we are glad that we shall have the assistance of two such excellent scholars, as Dean Liddell and the Cambridge Professor of Greek; from whom Mr. Ffoulkes has obtained two valuable opinions (pp. 191, 192). And now for the words which are to be our text. The whole paragraph appears in our present number, p. 509: it states that the Pope has received from Christ supremacy over the whole Church; "*καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν οἰκουμένων συνόδων καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται.*" We will first consider the general bearing of this clause, and afterwards the particular words which have been brought into question.

1. According to the Ultramontane view, this clause simply *adds* to what has preceded. The Council has already stated the doctrine, that Christ gave the Pope full power over the Church; and this clause adds the further proposition, that such doctrine is testified by councils and canons. Mr. Ffoulkes maintains that the clause should be understood—not as a simple *addition* to, —but as a most important *qualification* of, the statements which precede it. This then is the one turning point of controversy. Is the final clause an *addition* or a *qualification*? And on this turning-point, it is at once evident that the two critics, adduced by Mr. Ffoulkes, are not on his side but on ours. Each gives his own translation; but neither of those translations takes the clause as in any respect *qualifying* what went before.

2. We now proceed to individual expressions. The first is "*καθ' ὃν τρόπον.*" Bossuet and the *Union Review* translate this: "*secundum eum modum qui.*"\* But the Ultramontanes translate it "*quemadmodum;*" and Mr. Ffoulkes's two critics agree with the Ultramontane version.

3. The next word is "*καὶ.*" Ultramontanes maintain that the clause was originally expressed "*quemadmodum etiam;*" and that the Greek text, without any kind of violence, may be understood as having been what it was; viz., a translation of this. On this philological question, the two critics have not been consulted; and we should be extremely glad to hear their opinion.

They have both, however, laid down, that if the Greek had to be translated into Latin, this first "*καὶ*" should not be rendered "*etiam,*" but "*et:*" "*both in councils and, &c.;*" or again, "*not only in councils, but, &c.*" We readily accept this on their authority; having previously had no opinion on the matter, one way or other. The question is wholly immaterial. If the word "*etiam,*" indeed, be the original (as most undoubtedly it is), this circumstance is conclusive for the Ultramontane interpretation; but "*et*" accords

---

\* For Bossuet, see p. 510 of our present number. For the *Union Review*, see its number of last September, p. 571: "*in the way determined*" in acts and canons.

quite as germanely with the same interpretation. God has given to the Pope a supremacy ecclesiastically absolute; "as is contained," or set forth, "not only in acts of councils, but in sacred canons."

4. The word "*πρακτικοῖς*." Mr. Ffoulkes says, "few will deny" that this should rather be translated "*actis*" than "*gestis*." Here, again, the question is wholly immaterial; but Dean Liddell *does* deny it, and gives the word "*gestis*."

5. The word "*ἐπιλαμβάνω*." In October we asked, "Who ever heard of this word signifying 'determined,' 'appointed,' 'prescribed;' i. e., 'determined' in the sense of 'appointed' or 'prescribed.'"<sup>\*</sup> In January, we frankly stated that the present writer has no such knowledge of Greek, as to have justified him in speaking with this tone of confidence; but we added that none of Mr. Ffoulkes's citations prove at all to our mind, that the word ever *has* such a signification. We still disbelieve that it ever has: and at all events it is certain, that neither of Mr. Ffoulkes's witnesses avers to the contrary. The Cambridge Professor translates it, "defined, explained, set forth;" and this latter is the very phrase which we ourselves used in our last number (p. 285). Dean Liddell gives "*statuitur*," "is determined." But both these words are in themselves ambiguous: they may mean on the one hand, "prescribed;" "appointed;" or, on the other hand, "authoritatively declared." The Dean, however, clearly uses them in the latter sense, because the former would make the Decree unmeaning. The Decree states that Papal supremacy is *appointed* by Christ; it cannot, therefore, be "determined" in councils or canons, except by being "authoritatively declared" therein. The Dean at the same time confesses himself not adequately "versed in the Greek of the late times." Had he been so, he would most undoubtedly have held that "*continetur*" is a truer rendering than "*statuitur*." We proved this in our last number (pp. 284, 285). There can be no better authority for the meaning of a Greek word, than the use of a contemporary writer. Now in the Acts, written by Dorotheus, who was present at the Council, the word occurs fourteen times; and quite invariably in this very sense. *Mr. Ffoulkes has not attempted any reply to this fact; nor has he even pointed it out to the Greek critics whom he has consulted.*

But he is himself, indeed, completely at sea on the word. In p. 191 he translates it to "appoint" or "prescribe;" but in p. 206 to "interpret."<sup>†</sup> As these two meanings are perfectly irreconcilable, we shall be glad to hear from him which of the two he intends.

6. "*καθ' ὃν τρόπον ἐπιλαμβάνεται*." Ultramontanes understand this "*quemadmodum continetur*;" in accordance with the original Latin. Mr. Ffoulkes would render it "*according to the interpretation which may from time to time be given*."<sup>‡</sup> It requires no profound knowledge of Greek to pronounce this a philological monstrosity.

---

<sup>\*</sup> A few lines earlier we had said: "our opponent evidently uses this word 'determined' in the sense of 'appointed' or 'prescribed.'"

<sup>†</sup> In p. 191 he says that the word "has in fact turned out to signify" what we denied in October: viz., to "appoint" or "prescribe." As to p. 206 see our next note.

<sup>‡</sup> "We have [in the Decree] a most admirable statement of the power of

Now we cannot expect many of our readers to have followed us through this verbal controversy ; but we will conclude it with a significant and intelligible statement. We cannot ourselves, of course, solicit Dean Liddell and the Cambridge Professor to express an opinion. But we will forward them copies of our present number ; and we promise beforehand, that if Mr. Ffoulkes can induce them to express an opinion in his favour on purely philological grounds, we will acknowledge ourselves so far defeated.

Thirdly, Mr. Ffoulkes assumes throughout, that the clause "had been put in to satisfy" the Greeks (p. 204) ; that "the Greeks wished to guard against" a certain extreme view of papal supremacy "by the introduction of that clause" (p. 193). All this is so simple a romance, that we can only suppose our opponent to have gone to sleep over the Acts, and to have confused his subsequent dream with what he had read. The history of the matter is fully narrated in pp. 514-522 of our present number. Here it will suffice to say, that the clause was contained, word for word, in the Decree originally proposed by the Westerns ; and that the Decree was explained by them, both at the time and throughout, as containing the full Ultramontane doctrine.

Fourthly, there is a traditional interpretation of the Decree, in precise accordance with the Ultramontane. This Mr. Ffoulkes's facts alone conclusively establish. Turrecremata,\* in the very Council, after the Greeks had left, quoted the Decree without any mention of the "quemadmodum" clause (p. 202). Peter of Versailles, in the year 1441, complained that "for regulating the use of Papal power" the Council "had set forth nothing, had spoken nothing" (pp. 202, 3). Turrecremata, in reply, "never contradicts this statement" (ib). "The ultra-Latinisers among the Greeks" used language altogether similar (p. 203). In fact, "every writer who had described the Decree up to" the year 1480 had spoken in the same way (p. 205). Mr. Ffoulkes, with his usual fondness for bespattering respected Catholic names, attributes all this to intentional dishonesty. The obvious and true explanation is of course, that the "quemadmodum" clause did not in any respect qualify any preceding statement, but merely made a further statement in addition.

Fifthly, Mr. Ffoulkes now very unostentatiously, but very unmistakably, abandons his whole statement, that the existing Latin is a translation made by Caryophilus 150 years after the Council. "I have no doubt," he says (p. 202) "that . . . Caryophilus appropriated . . . without scruple" S. Antoninus's "version," "which was that of a member of the Council, afterwards Archbishop of the city in which it was held, and a saint ;" and which purported, moreover (as Mr. Foulkes has already admitted) to be no "version" at all, but the original Decree itself.† In other words, Mr. Ffoulkes now

the Pope ; . . . viz., that it is exactly what the living Church, in full Œcumenical council, . . . interprets it to be from time to time and to the end of time" (p. 206).

\* Mr. Ffoulkes has read the Florentine Acts most superficially. He could not otherwise (see p. 202) have made the most strange mistake, of confusing John Turrecremata with John the Dominican Provincial of Lombardy. See e.g. pp. 514, 518 of our present number.

† "Two contemporary historians of note, without attempting anything like a full summary of what passed at the Council of Florence, have inserted *its Decree* in one of their chapters" (p. 201) : viz., S. Antoninus and Blondus.

admits the very fact which he has hitherto been so strenuously denying; viz., that Caryophilus did not himself translate the Decree into Latin at all, but introduced into his work that which purported to be the very Latin original. We might certainly have expected, that Mr. Ffoulkes should have directed more emphatic attention, to so complete a surrender of his whole argument; and that he should have expressed some regret, for the outrageous blunder into which he has been betrayed.

But what can he possibly mean in p. 189 by again repeating that very blunder, which he abandons in p. 203; viz., that the Latin "was a translation from the Greek . . . the work of Caryophilus?" nay, and by quoting Mansi in defence of it? The edition of Mansi, to which we have access, is paged differently from Mr. Ffoulkes's; and we have been unable to verify his quotation. But we have no doubt whatever what it is which Mansi said; and in expressing this "*nostro periculo*," we give Mr. Ffoulkes every chance he can desire, of exposing our rash conjecture. We believe that Mr. Ffoulkes's wild misapprehension of Mansi originated in the following way.

There is no more curious feature in all Mr. Ffoulkes's argument, than his constant confusion of the *Greek Acts* with the *Synodal Decree*. The former are merely a private history of the Council, written by one who was present at it. But the Decree is a most solemn ecclesiastical document, for which Pope, Emperor, and bishops made themselves responsible; and which included an infallible definition of faith, binding the interior belief of Catholics for all time. Yet, when Bossuet speaks of an "*authenticum Concilii Florentini*," Mr. Ffoulkes says (p. 195) that this should mean "*an original of its Acts from first to last, including the Decree*" (p. 195). What can be more strange than this? And so in the instance before us. Mansi, of course, states the well known fact, that Caryophilus translated the *Greek Acts*; and Mr. Ffoulkes characteristically confuses a translation of the Acts, with a translation of the Decree.

Lastly, are the words "*quemadmodum etiam*" contained in the original Latin? On this head Mr. Ffoulkes's paper really reads as though it were intended, like Dr. Whately's "*Historic Doubts*," to be a burlesque on the absurdities of scepticism. Consider only a part of the evidence which we adduced in pp. 286, 7. Bossuet, who felt that these words were an almost insuperable obstacle in his way, yet candidly admitted that their authenticity was undeniable. "*This*," he says, "*is certain (constat) from an original of the Council in the Colbertine library.*" "*He does not say*," replies Mr. Ffoulkes, "*that he has seen it himself*" (p. 195). But Orsi's friend testifies, that he did see with his own eyes an original preserved in the Vatican; and that he possesses a most accurate transcript of another original; both containing the words in question. "*What is stated*," says Mr. Ffoulkes, oracularly (p. 198), "*filled me with misgivings about its accuracy.*"\* He adds, "*it was the statement,*

---

\* We may here put our opponent right on a small matter. "According to" Orsi's friend "there were just five copies of the Decree and no more" (p. 198). Orsi's friend neither says, nor implies ever so distantly, anything of the kind. It was *we* who made the statement, on the authority of the *Greek Acts*. But as we have pointed out in this number (p. 532), neither Greek nor

not of Orsi but of a nameless friend." Well, we did not happen to name him ; but Orsi does. It is much to be regretted, indeed, that Mr. Ffoulkes had not access to Orsi's work ; for he would have seen that this friend was no other than the learned Mamachius, about as good a judge on such a matter as can well be named. Mamachius declares it to be a matter "*mihi certè exploratum et cognitum*," that there were five originals in his time, all containing the words "*quemadmodum etiam*." And at last, after all his criticism and suspicions, Mr. Ffoulkes, at the end of his article, is obliged to admit, that he has himself just found an original in the British Museum ; and that there, in black and white, are the very words in dispute. The question, then, we suppose, is at last settled. Every theological student, except Mr. Ffoulkes and the *Union* reviewer, will be unfeignedly surprised that it can ever have been raised.

We cannot gravely continue so puerile a controversy. If Mr. Ffoulkes brings forward hereafter any new point worthy of attention, we will not fail to notice it. But if he produces another paper like the present, we must leave him in full possession of the last word.

---

*A Treatise on Auricular Confession, Dogmatical, Historical, and Practical.*  
By REV. RAPHAEL MELIA, D.D. Dublin : Duffy.

THIS little work consists of two parts: the first mainly historical, the second dogmatical and practical. We cannot praise the latter too unreservedly. Dr. Melia has taken great pains, and with proportionate success, to place clearly and fully before his readers, the Church's teaching on this most momentous subject. We will give two extracts on matters of vital importance :—

"A person addicted to shameful sins, casting his eyes down upon hell, terrified at such a sight, tremblingly says, '*I do not want to go to hell; I am sorry for my sins*.' But at the same time he does not hate his sinful pleasures as the cause of offending a Just God, who condemns to hell : nay, he would wish that there would be no hell, in order to enjoy more freely the gratification of the flesh. This poor sinner cannot be pardoned by God" (pp. 181, 2).

"Sorrow, moreover, must be *supreme*—that is, above all other grief : so that we have to detest, abhor, and hate sin beyond every other evil, and prefer to undergo any other evil than this one . . . so that we be heartily ready to sacrifice everything on earth, rather than offend God [mortally], and be disposed to endure any temporal evil and suffer every kind of affliction, rather than commit one mortal sin" (pp. 198, 200).

The first part of the work contains many most interesting facts ; but we confess that, as a whole, we find it less satisfactory than the second.

This notice was written for our last number ; but by an unfortunate inadvertence did not appear.

---

Latin Acts can be trusted for every individual fact they mention. Orsi's friend says, "*plurane fuerint subsignata necne, non equidem laboro*."

*Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects.* By the late FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D.D., Priest of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri. Vol. 1, Mysteries and Festivals. London: Richardson & Son. 1866.

WE are indebted to the Fathers of the London Oratory for these memorials of their late and first Provost; whose labours in our Lord's vineyard are now so well and so widely made manifest in the fruits of benediction which they have brought to so many souls; but whose singleness of purpose, unwearied zeal, and generous forbearance, are best known to those who were most in his confidence. Those who knew him in life, and who heard him preach, will be glad to possess the fragments which remain to us of those sermons, the charm and power of which were so irresistible. The "Notes," we are told by F. Bowden their patient and laborious editor, "in their present form were not meant to be made public;" because, as it seems, they are neither more nor less than the notes which F. Faber provided himself with, either for the purpose of his sermons, or of the series of books which he had begun to publish; but which he never lived to finish, to the great sorrow of his many friends.

The account which the editor gives of this volume is so accurate and complete, that we can do nothing better than repeat it:—

"It is intended," says F. Bowden, "to serve as a collection, wherein may be found considerations, in a short form, upon the chief allegations of the Faith and the Spiritual Life; and from which religious communities, and those engaged in missionary labour, may draw materials for meditation and instruction" (Pref., xi.).

While the "Notes" serve to refresh the memory of those who heard the sermons, of which they are the outlines, they will serve also, as F. Bowden suggests, as hints for meditation of the most valuable kind; and, indeed, they may be regarded in that light alone by many to their exceeding great profit. Those who have to teach others, will find them a mine into which they may safely descend, and out of which they may bring up the most precious ore of truth.

The Passion of our Lord occupies a very considerable space, and every one who will look into it will regret that the Treatise on the Passion was never written fully out; for of that we have here but one chapter; and yet that chapter is a treatise of itself.

We shall make but one extract, when we should be glad if we could make many: it is from the sermon which F. Faber preached so early as 1848, on the Feast of the Martyr S. Thomas, in the Martyr's church at Fulham. The Pope was then, as now, in trouble; he was even an exile and dependent on others for a refuge from the murderous men who had conspired to dethrone him. F. Faber's faith was not shaken, nor was his loyalty dimmed. He believed, and was therefore strong. He was not one who explained away the nature of the Church, or the supremacy of the Pope, or the severity of a doctrine, or the disagreeableness of a custom: the Church was to him the work of God; not that only, but the temple of the Holy Ghost, in which the Holy Ghost was ever living—the abiding and unfailing Teacher.



"Beware, in your conversation with others, how you represent the Church of God to those whom you desire to allure within her pale; beware of representing her for one moment as though she were different from what she was in days of old; beware of representing her as abating one jot or tittle of the greatest of those pretensions which seemed most arrogant and most preposterous even in the middle ages; beware of representing her as changed one atom in this her temper and her spirit; no, we must adhere strictly and zealously to high principle, disregarding everything that present or temporary advantage may appear to put within our reach. Truth, remember—and this is one great distinction between Catholics and heretics—truth is not ours, but God's. Truth is not ours to bate and pare down. Truth is God's; it has God's majesty inherent within it, and it will convert the souls of men, even when it seems rudest and most repelling; and it will do so for this one reason—because it is God's truth, and because we through the grace of God have boldness and faith to put our trust in it. And again, beware of another evil, that of trying to throw aside or to pare down what seems most faithful and warm in the devotions of foreign lands; do not tell that cruel falsehood, do not tell it to those whom you love, and are longing and yearning to have within the Church, do not tell them that the faith is other here than what it is elsewhere; do not throw aside devotion and sweetness, and worship and affection, as though they were not fit for us, as though God's Church were not one; for this is nothing less in reality than to deny the unity of God's Church. Tell them not this. Take not the bread from between their teeth, to bring them within the pale of God's Church, to find that they themselves have been deceived, and that you, while you wished to attract and allure, have only so much the more effectually repelled them, and have taken from them that which, in a moment of faith and love, they would have most generously embraced. This is, indeed, doing a cruel work, and it is in this very respect that S. Thomas is to us so bright an example. Believe me, dear Brethren, if there be a land—if there be a people—in which high principle is acceptable from its own intrinsic value, or alluring from the national character of those around us, it is this dear land of ours. Let us have faith, firm, vigorous, unfaltering faith; and, trust me, there is in high principle something which humbles those who hold it. They are never humble who have not high principle. They may be courtly, they may be pusillanimous, but humble they cannot be; for there is in high principles, and high principles alone, that which humbles those who hold them, that which wins those to whom those high principles are put forward; and above all, there is in these high principles, and in none other, the plenitude of that heavenly blessing which Jesus has lodged in the bosom of His people."

---

*Fitzgerald v. Northcote and another.* Report in full from short hand notes, with introductory statement, correspondence, &c. London: Burns & Co.

**T**HIS case, which deeply concerns the interests of education in general, and of our Catholic colleges in particular, came before the Court of Queen's Bench on the 5th of February, and lasted three days. It has been thought well to bring the whole proceedings before the public in a collected form. They who have done this are not afraid of the true verdict which its perusal will ensure. It is preceded by a short notice from the Rev. Edward Knight, vice-president of Oscott, and by a letter from the Bishop of Birmingham, written with his lordship's usual penetration and felicity.

The first thought which occurs to the reader of these proceedings is, that before an English jury a priest has little chance of success. Our boasted love of fair play and impartiality is here little better than a boast. Fair play turns to foul play whenever certain points are touched on which Englishmen have a strong bias. We admit the characteristic to be part of the English nature to a certain extent, and of this we should make much in order to encourage its growth; but it is well also to remember that even the English nation did fall in Adam, and that of this she gives abundant proof, even in that darling virtue in which it is popularly thought she excels all the world. An eminent lawyer, who was present at the trial, mentioned to us that he saw a change come over the jury the moment they saw and recognised *the priest*. The verdict seemed to be arrived at, and we all knew that they unofficially declared it, even before the priest had opened his mouth, and officially announced it as soon as they were permitted to speak.

The Catholics of England, and we might fairly say a great portion of the public press of England, and more privately the profession of the bar, have already reversed that verdict. St. Mary's Oscott comes out of the ordeal simply with honour. It is to the credit of Oscott that its President would not have hesitated to expel a boy of mutinous spirit and ungentlemanly conduct, because his father happened to be in a high position, and because this student's removal might occasion that of five other kinsmen. It is creditable on account of the spirit, which, as this act shews us, Dr. Northcote infuses into the society which he governs. The conduct of the students, upon hearing of the unfavourable verdict of the English jury, fully justifies the opinion which we have always entertained of the high and chivalrous character of the Oscottians. So far from rejoicing that their superior had suffered a defeat at the hands of one of themselves, they spontaneously declared that young Fitzgerald was not of them, and that they themselves were one in heart and sentiment with their President in this performance of his painful duty. It seems to us, that Dr. Northcote acted with singular forbearance and kindness towards the student, who brought on, after fair and clear warning, his own expulsion.

If the President and the Prefect have suffered much anxiety through the discharge of their duty, they have, at all events, the satisfaction to reflect that the prosecution they have endured has raised the college in the estimation of the Catholic public, rather than depressed it. We believe Dr. Northcote has had letters of congratulation and sympathy from the heads of even Protestant public schools. He has had not merely the congratulations and sympathies of Catholics, but their spontaneous and generous co-operation. We understand that the expenses of the defence have been almost wholly defrayed by the subscriptions raised mainly among old Oscottians and the houses of Catholic education which are scattered over England.

We cannot help rejoicing in another indirect result of this trial, we mean the public expression of opinion on the advantage of distinct ecclesiastical education for persons destined for the sublime office of the priesthood. Even Protestants, who cannot themselves appreciate the motives for it, have uttered this sentiment. For ourselves, we have always strongly felt that the advantages and blessings of purely ecclesiastical education are simply inestimable

This, of course, is no new idea to the Catholic episcopate of England ; for, as the volume before us proves from the Archives of Oscott, so early as 1793, a "Plan of Oscott Seminary" was published in that year, and it was stated that the "end of the institution is to supply one priest yearly to the mission ; and that as the course of education is limited to six years, it is necessary that the seminary be established for the education of six students." This was the original aim of those who first founded Oscott. That which caused its failure in those days, would be powerless now. And we have abundant testimonies from authorities in Rome, and at home, that the plan which was unsuccessfully attempted in 1793 has not been thrown aside, but that it has been matured, and will be attempted by all our bishops as soon as they see the fit moment has arrived. While we condole with Dr. Northcote, then, upon the annoyances he has had to put up with, we also congratulate him upon many advantages which this trial has brought out ; and we state our conviction, that the least will not be this, that it has contributed to strengthen public opinion in favour of the instruction of the Council of Trent "*De formâ erigendi seminarium clericarum.*"

---

*Missionary College, chiefly for Pagan Nations.* London : Knowles.

WE hope in an early number to speak of the glorious enterprise whose humble beginnings are recorded in this most admirable paper. It is, in truth, rather strange that the Catholics of these islands have hitherto possessed no such institution (for the admirable colleges of Allhallows and Carlow are not for heathen missions, p. 13, note), than that one should now be started. Catholic England, in giving F. Vaughan every assistance, will but fulfil her bounden duty, considering the millions of heathen dependent on this Empire. But in fulfilling her duty she will derive an inappreciable advantage ; for such an undertaking as this college cannot but react in a most salutary way on our ecclesiastical training at home. This is pointed out, indeed, by the Bishop of Birmingham (p. 29) in his very touching letter.

---

WE have been disappointed regarding a notice which we had hoped to insert on the Rev. Dr. M'Carthy's comment on "the Epistles and Gospels of the Sundays throughout the year" (Dublin : Mullany. London : Burns & Co.). We the less regret this, however, as an admirable criticism of the work appeared in *The Month* of February ; with every word of which we concur, and to which we cordially refer our readers. Dr. M'Carthy's volume is among the most important Scriptural works which have been addressed in our time to the English-speaking Catholic world. We are obliged also to postpone until our next quarter a review of the eloquent and edifying life of the Hon. and Rev. Father Ignatius Spencer, by F. Pius, a Sp. Sancto, Passionist.

DR. WARD republishes his argument on "doctrinal decisions which are not definitions of faith," which has appeared from time to time in this REVIEW. He has added a Preface, which may serve both as an analysis of his various essays, and also as a kind of cramp to hold them together. He explains in that Preface that he is throughout addressing Catholics; and only applying himself to an investigation of the Church's teaching on the subject. His main principle is that the Church *possesses* whatever infallibility she *claims*; and his main business, therefore, is to consider the dry and simple question what infallibility she does claim. In these days the matter is admitted by every one to be of inappreciable importance. All which he desires of his readers is that they will labour to put aside prejudice; and, under a grave sense of responsibility, seek seriously for the truth. And all which he desires of his critics is that they will treat the matter on the ground of argument, and not as a theme for vague declamation and invective. Of this there has been a great deal too much.

---

## Foreign Events of Catholic Interest.

---

A LARGE majority of those who were entitled to vote took no part in the late Italian elections. The candidates who offered their services were numerous ; but the electors were few. The eagerness and zeal were all on one side,—on the side of those who had something to gain. The people were utterly indifferent,—they remained deaf to every appeal that was made to excite their interest in the proceedings. It was all one to them who was elected. In every part of the country, indifference, more or less strongly marked, prevailed. Candidates of every description, lavish in promises, thronged the electoral booths. Ministerialists, Mazzinians, and Liberals of every shade, contended fiercely with one another ; but the people stayed away. The streets were dull ; a stranger in a city which was electing its representatives would scarcely have been aware that anything unusual was taking place, had his eye not been arrested by the flaring placards on the walls. But this abstention of the people was not the result of any deep-laid policy, or of any shrinking, from conscientious motives, to exercise under the rule of Victor Emmanuel their political rights. On the contrary, not a few Catholics and Conservatives of note, zealous for the preservation of the Church and of the nation, had urged, with all the authority which their position and character gave them, the necessity of vigorous action on the part of the large Catholic majority of the people in the elections. But the Catholic majority to a great extent took no pains or part in the matter ; for in truth the real people of Italy have no trust or confidence whatsoever in the constitutional system as practised by the clique who, backed by the armies of France, have taken possession of their country, and who ever since have done nothing else but consume the substance of Italy and persecute its Church. The people believe, whether rightly or wrongly, that such a state of things is not to be altered by casting an adverse vote into the electoral urn. To them such an attempt seems labour lost, for they feel assured that were a Catholic majority returned, the Chambers would be dissolved at once by the unscrupulous men who are masters of the kingdom. The people of the south of Italy have not forgotten—how should they ?—the atrocious fusillading, the cold-blooded massacre, the wholesale burnings, which so recently desolated whole tracts of the country. They know the character of their masters. They stand by and await the end. Thus, while the large Catholic majority of the people regards the elections with profound indifference, the Government, in virtue of the lavish and profligate expenditure on its parliamentary supporters, have it all their own way. The Mazzinians, moreover, are by no means content

with the measure of success which, by the aid of the masonic and secret societies, has fallen to their lot. Whilst, on the one hand, the Conservatives are urged by many journals, says the *Civiltà Cattolica*, not to let slip from their hands the opportunity of sending to the chambers men of conscience, capable of making head against the revolution, or of at least raising their voice in defence of religion trampled under foot—of the Church despoiled—of the rights of property attacked; on the other hand, the Garibaldians are all in a rage against what, with good reason, is called the *clique*—that party, namely, which has for its leaders the Minghettis, the Peruzzis, or the present Ministry. Thus, a fortnight before the voting took place, the *Diritto*, the organ of Mazzini, prophesizes that “without a miracle—we don’t know by whom it ought to be or could be worked,—the future elections will give us a new chamber which will follow close upon the heels of the last. Of speechifying, declamation, talk, of proposals and amplifications, we have already had more than enough; but before the end of October we shall have still much more. But when it comes to the cutting of the knots, then we shall have nothing but thick fogs and puffed-up clouds, with much disjointing of jaws and straining of throats.” “From which it is to be inferred,” observes the *Civiltà Cattolica*, “that even the *Diritto* knows and confesses that the Italians are anything but enthusiastic for the system of representative or parliamentary government, since nothing is able to induce them to make use of those rights which are essential to the constitution. But the Mazzinian organ,” it adds, “proclaims at the top of its voice as a truth, based on facts what, from the mouth of a Conservative, would have been characterized as malignant exaggeration or calumny.” Let us listen again to the *Diritto*; for it is interesting to see truth wrung by the force of facts from the mouth of an enemy. “He,” it says, “who is under the persuasion that Italy knows how to govern itself, runs the risk of suffering a great disenchantment in the next elections. It appears to us that they will show how the people of Italy allow themselves to be governed by a few busybodies who, by means of promises a thousand times proved mendacious, and of scarecrows at which even children nowadays ought to laugh, deceive not the multitudes who, careless of parties, stand lazily by, but certain small sections of faithful followers to whom belongs the making or the unmaking of Italy. Little by little we are being persuaded,” it adds, “not without much grief and bitterness of spirit, that the affairs of our country are in reality governed by an oligarchy—an oligarchy so much the worse and the guiltier as it is not constituted by laws and statutes, but is artificially built up by the wickedness of the few; and endured, sheep-like, by the incapacity of the multitude.” What a confession! Has it come to this, then, after all, that the revolution which has robbed the Pope of more than two-thirds of his territory—which has confiscated church property, banished we know not how many bishops from their sees, suppressed monasteries, turned nuns out upon the street,—which everywhere has encouraged licence and blasphemy and irreligion; which has fusilladed the people by tens of thousands in cold blood, and filled the prisons to suffocation, and has brought Italy to the verge of absolute bankruptcy—was accomplished, not by the Italian people, nor with their consent,



but, on its own showing, by the wickedness of a small and now divided minority. Criminally negligent, it is true, of their highest interests, the people of Italy are nevertheless guiltless of active complicity in the revolution, as we have all along contended; they have stood idly by and watched the ruin which they could have averted. Whilst the active and guilty few, aided by the material support of the secret societies of Europe, by the moral support of England, at least since the notorious letters of Mr. Gladstone to Lord Aberdeen, and at last by the armed intervention of Napoleon, have made Italy what it is. The mendacious and guilty oligarchy which now governs the country is beseeching in vain for the support of the people; but the people stand by in silence; the electors won't vote; the ratepayers are unwilling to pay the tremendous cost of a work they never consented to. Things are coming to a dead-lock. But supposing, for argument's sake, the Italian people to be totally indifferent to the welfare of religion, and to the preservation of all the most sacred institutions of the country, yet surely a sublime indifference to taxation is no peculiarity of the Italian character. They know that deputies impose the taxes under which the country is groaning, and that the electors make the deputies; but, nevertheless, on the day of the elections the voters stayed within doors. Whence this indifference, then, except from the profound conviction, rightly or wrongly felt, that the elections are a farce, or worse; and that no matter how the elections were to turn out, nothing would change the course of things, or hold the hands of those—freemasons, infidels, revolutionists, home or foreign, crowned or uncrowned—who are now in possession of the country? In a word, the Italians believe—and what business have we who judge from a distance to question the reasonableness of their conviction?—that the European revolution which is become incarnate in the Italian Government is not a power that can be checked by casting a vote in the urn.

"The Italians are convinced," says the *Civiltà Cattolica*, "that elections and deputies serve to no purpose; that it is not worth while to lose time in the tedious operation of putting on a fixed day, and at the call of the journals, a bit of paper in a wooden box, then infallibly to see issue out of it—we do not know by what unhappy chemical combination—as out of a Pandora's box, a pestilential flood of corruptions, of wickednesses and confusion, of injustice, of thefts and violence and strife, and especially of taxes." "All are agreed," adds this writer, "that the indifference has been greater at the late than at former elections. What does this, then, show? It simply shows the force of experience; for out of former elections the good of Italy was to have sprung, but instead thereof is come the present ruin."

Hence the existence of an indifference which, at such a juncture, to say the least, seems so strange in a Catholic people. If we examine the results of the elections more closely we shall see that the present chamber—which, we believe, is but too ready, not only to endorse all the worst acts of its predecessor, but, at the bidding of the Government, to commit still more guilty sacrileges—is in no wise the representative of the people of Italy. In the *Unità Cattolica* of the 24th and 25th of October a complete analysis of the elections was published, from which we now cite—for such facts explain, of themselves, the state and

hopes of Italy—the following examples:—The electors of Florence number 10,531; of whom only 3,501 took part in the elections. The four Government candidates in the capital of the kingdom, a city of 150,000 inhabitants, obtained scarcely 1,413 votes, whilst the opposition split up into numerous factions, claimed for its various candidates 2,088 votes. At Milan, which has 250,000 inhabitants, and 10,450 registered electors, only 3,860 voted, and yet the enemies of the Papacy triumphantly described such an election as a battle gained over the temporal power of the Pope! At Turin, “so long accustomed to parliamentary life,” says the *Diritto*, educated for so many years to consider and understand the importance of elections, and this time more than ever interested, by the use of the electoral urn, to take care of its own fortunes, the number of those who abstained was surprisingly large. In this city of 180,000 inhabitants, and of 4,906 registered electors, only 1,389 cared to come to the poll. At Bologna—to continue our selection of representative cities—with its 96,660 inhabitants and its 4,942 registered electors, the contest was not able to beat up more than 1,930 votes. In Genoa, a city of 120,000 inhabitants and 3,435 electors, only 1,744 voted. In Parma, with a population of 46,000 and 3,220 electors, only 1,450 voted. In Ancona, with 40,000 inhabitants and 1,365 electors, only 757 gave their suffrages. But still more marked and striking, and still more offensive to the Government, was the manner in which the provinces of the south mistrustfully abstained from the elections. Naples, with its half-million of inhabitants, has 46,646 registered electors, but of these scarcely 5,000 took part in the elections. These figures speak for themselves, and afford an ample and convincing proof of the indifference and hostility of the mass of the people of Italy towards those who by craft, unscrupulous treachery, and foreign intervention, have gained possession of the unhappy country which they have already brought to the brink of ruin. Out of such a chamber, so composed, consisting to a large extent of unknown and untried men, who have come to seek their fortunes in the head-quarters of unprincipled and profligate expenditure, the Government can make what it chooses. Many of the former deputies, leaders of the extreme party, men notorious for their hostility to the Church, as well as to the existing order of things, have lost their seats, but their places have been filled, if by better, nevertheless by men more docile to the direction of the Government. The voracity, moreover, of Liberal deputies is proverbial in Italy, says a writer familiar with the class, in allusion to the Homeric laugh with which the famous “Let us be honest” of Ricasoli was received throughout Italy. Any measures, no matter how extreme or how dishonest, brought in by the Ministry, the dispensers of the last loaves and fishes of Italy, will be certain to receive the sanction of a chamber so obsequious and docile as the present.

An acute and intelligent observer of things, familiar with political affairs, at home and abroad, reports from Italy “an entire absence of all order, regularity, and respect for law.” He gives, as an instance of such a kind, “the open spoliation of Church property, in direct violation of a statute of Charles Albert, that property of every kind whatsoever should be held sacred. Another of Charles Albert’s laws—that the

Catholic Apostolic Roman faith is the *sole* religion of the State—is now openly set at nought. In fine, the Florentine Government sets itself above all laws, and repudiates all principles which stand in the way of its iniquitous objects." As an evidence of the administrative incapacity of the Government, our informant cites a fact within his own knowledge, that on the 3rd of February last a telegraphic despatch was forwarded by the *Ministero di Grazia e Giustizia* of Florence to the President of the *Tribunale di terza stanza* in Milan, apprising him that this very tribunal was to be dissolved at the end of the *previous* month. A tribunal thus left, in the full exercise of its powers, unaware even of its intended extinction, far less conscious that it had already for days been dissolved, is a fact such as may give some idea of the Babylonian confusion which at present prevails in the "Kingdom of Italy!"

But disaffection as well as administrative incapacity is jeopardizing the popularity of Victor Emmanuel,\* as well as the stability of the revolutionary kingdom. A meeting, similar in its character to one recently held in Naples, took place on the 25th of February at Porta S. Giorgio, ten miles from Civitanova, at which the following resolutions were adopted:—The reinstating of Mazzini, who has recently been elected deputy, in his civil and political rights. 2nd. The reconstruction of the army of Garibaldi. 3rd. The immediate suppression of all religious corporations. 4th. War against Austria for Venice. 5th. Open hostility against any stranger occupying Italian soil. 6th. The occupation of Rome, the capital of Italy. 7th. The abolition of some taxes, and the reduction of others. More than five hundred persons from Romagna and the Marches, and also, it is said, from the Kingdom of Naples, attended this meeting, which was brought to a close amid cries of *Vivà Mazzini!* *Vivà Garibaldi!* and *Vivà la Repubblica Italiana!* In consequence of these open manifestations of disaffection, the Government sent two regiments of the line from Macerata towards Fermo. At Civitanova placards—which, however, were quickly removed by the police—were posted, calling upon the clergy to leave the town immediately, or woe would betide them, and threatening, at no distant day, an attack upon the Government of Rome. The *Armonia*, of the 8th of March, reports that the demagogues at Florence are making preparations for a Mazzinian demonstration, in order to assert the validity of Mazzini's election, but from the latest accounts we learn that, out of deference to France—the master of Italy—the chambers have annulled the election of Messina. There can be no

---

\* The King, the other day, was mobbed and insulted on the road, as he was passing, *incognito*, to his villa, for he never sleeps at the Pitti Palace; but this, no doubt, arose from the company he was in, described as "una persona ragguardevole." He met with the like insults on another occasion, as he was driving over a bridge. But the people are not only demoralized by the example of the King, their morals are corrupted of set purpose, as we learn from unquestionable sources, by the acts of the authorities themselves. We need only refer, as an instance, to the "institution" set up at the town of Bra by the public delegate, as described in the *Unità Cattolica* of the 8th of March.

question that the election of the veteran conspirator, still under sentence of death by the Piedmontese courts for his attempt against the monarchy, and condemned by the courts of France for complicity with Rudio and Imperatori in a plot against the life of the Emperor, was as illegal as it was disgraceful. Demonstrations are now being made in distracted Italy, not only on behalf of Mazzini, but also against Venice. Many persons of rank and influence refuse to take part in the so-called National Subscription unless the money be expended, not to pay off the Italian debt, but to increase the Army and to make war on Venetia. The relations, indeed, between Austria and Prussia, arising out of the deplorable aggressions of those two powers on the Danish monarchy, and from the manifest determination of Bismark, the Cavour of Germany, to appropriate to Prussia the spoils of the joint invasion of the Duchies, are of such a threatening and warlike nature as, not unnaturally, to revive the hopes of the party of action for the acquisition of Venice. These hopes, to say the least, have not been damped by certain speeches, of a warlike tendency, uttered of late in the Florentine chambers. But apart from what may be a passing excitement, owing to the circumstances of the moment in Germany, the royal speech, which at the opening of the chambers was put into the hands of the King, leaves no apparent chance of a reconciliation with Rome, holds out no hope of a return to a more settled and peaceful state of things in Italy. The King, and the minority in the cabinet which supports him, have not the manliness to front the difficulties that obstruct all retracing of the revolutionary march, and avert, by such a noble courage, the dangers which threaten the dynasty itself as well as religion, and the peace, if not the very existence of the ill-jointed kingdom. The task which is to be done by such a chamber and such a ministry is enough to appal any statesman capable of understanding its character or at all foreseeing its consequences. Three questions stare the Ministry in the face: the suppression of the monasteries, bankruptcy, and the French convention. These difficulties have to be encountered before the close of the year. On the bankrupt state of Italian finance we need not enlarge. It is a state which affects, if not every heart, at least every interest; and, therefore, is already familiar to the public. The *Times*, however it may condone the political immoralities of Italy, is shocked beyond measure at its financial profligacy, and has recently read the Government of Florence many a severe but wholesome lesson on the enormous debt which has sprung up in the last five years, and which is accumulating at such a rate, and so beyond all the resources of the country to meet, as to threaten, within no long space of time, a national bankruptcy. The Minister of Finance has announced a deficit of three millions of francs, which has to be met, as he says, "some way or other," by confiscating, that means, church property and by laying new and heavy imposts on an already overburdened people. Every year hitherto but adds to the enormous debt.

The deficit of last year was 207 millions of francs, or rather more than eight and a quarter millions sterling, an amount considerably above the estimate. The estimated deficit for 1866 is 261 millions, or nearly ten millions and a half sterling. The total expenditure for 1866 is estimated at 928 millions of francs, the total revenue 667 millions, thus leaving a deficit of

nearly 40 per cent. on the income of the country. These terrible financial facts were received by the chambers, we are not surprised to hear, with a morose silence. "How is this deficit to be met?" asks the minister. To remedy this enormous inequality between the income and the expenditure of the revolutionary kingdom, Signor Sella had nothing to propose but a large increase of taxation, which still left, at the very best, a hopeless deficit of 100 millions of francs. In consequence of the universal dissatisfaction Signor Sella had to resign, and a new minister has had to try his hand. Among the most obnoxious of the proposed taxes was, in addition to the house-tax of last year, a tax on doors and windows, and a most unpopular and oppressive tax on the grinding of corn (*manciato*), which is estimated to bring in a net product of about one hundred millions of francs. But national disarmament, the only real remedy for this bankrupt state, is not spoken of. The Minister of Finance dares only attempt a very paltry reduction in the national expenditure. Because, so corrupt and precarious is the existing state of things, that a sensible reduction of the lavish expenditure—which means, putting a stop to wholesale bribery and corruption—or the partial disbanding of the immense army, might be as dangerous to the existence of the revolutionary government of Florence as bankruptcy itself. On the serious reduction, therefore, of debt and taxation—which, more than anything else, are now agitating Italy—the royal speech was almost silent.

But no such reticence was used on the question of the separation of the Church and State, and on the suppression of the religious bodies.

The King also says that his Government "broke off the negotiations with Rome when it judged that they might be prejudicial to the rights of the crown and the nation." An end has thus been put, for a time, to the hope of the reconciliation of the Italian Government with the Church. Is there, then, no turning back when the downward course of the revolution has once been entered on? Is the national demoralization to be allowed to go on unchecked, and anarchy left to work out its own cure in horrors from the mere contemplation of which all ought to shrink? Pius IX., in a grand pontifical way of viewing things, opened the door for a reconciliation of Italy with the Church; forgetful of personal insults and injuries, and of all mere political aims, he sought only to uphold the eternal principles of justice, and to carry out the great work entrusted to his charge—the welfare of the Church and the salvation of souls.

The Vegezzi negotiations, however, which promised so well at first, were broken off under revolutionary pressure; and the King, in the speech from the throne, has justified the act of his Government. But the attempt at a reconciliation made by Pius IX., in its disinterestedness and moral grandeur, will be remembered as not the least of the acts of his noble pontificate. It is to be hoped, before it is too late—before rebellion and irreligion have done their worst—that Italy may yet hearken to the voice of Rome, and enter upon such negotiations as may lead to a thorough reconciliation with the Papacy.

But the speech from the throne takes the side of the revolution, and sets before the Chambers a most subversive policy. We have already spoken of

the financial ruin the Government has to repair in haste, and of the dangers of an increased taxation on an already exhausted country; but, if this difficulty even is tided over for the time by some desperate financial make-shift, the questions of the suppression of the monastic bodies and of the separation of the Church and State have still to be dealt with.

The effect of separating the State from the Church will be to make irreligion an institution in Italy. It is a desperate attempt on the part of the revolution to make itself permanent; it is like the Greeks burning their ships before Troy, to cut off all possibility of retreat. The proposal even of such a godless measure is an insult to the Catholicism of the country. "How long, O anarchy, will you continue to abuse our patience?" the Catholics of Italy may well say, paraphrasing the oration of their Roman ancestor, to the revolution attempting such an impiety; but we still believe the revolution is not yet master enough of the land to succeed in such an attempt. It is also hard to conceive that the Italian Government will be able, much as it may wish, to suppress the monastic orders. Monasticism is so interwoven with the life and religion of Italy, it is so full of glorious traditions, so rich in good works, it has such a hold on the affections and on the veneration of the people, as to make it appear almost impossible that it should be suppressed without greater violence than the revolutionary government would think it prudent to employ at the present juncture.

The confiscation of monastic property—the accumulated bequests of ages of piety and charitable benevolence—invariably spent in the neighbourhood of the monasteries and convents, either in the support of the aged and poor, or on the education of the people, or in building churches, endowing colleges, or in founding hospitals; the confiscation of all such property, real or personal, now in the possession of monks and nuns who have committed no offence, broken no public law, is so outrageous an attack, not only on the most sacred interests of the people, but on the rights of property itself, as we cannot but hope will make men hesitate before they commit themselves to so dangerous and unprincipled a measure.

The local influence of the monastic bodies is naturally very strong; the people of the districts in which monastic property is situated would be deeply aggrieved at seeing the Government of Florence sweep into its exhausted coffers the rich proceeds of estates which had hitherto been spent in the enrichment or for the benefit of their neighbourhood. To appease so obvious and so powerful an opposition to their measures of confiscation, the Government propose to devote a third of the proceeds of their plunder to local institutions. It remains to be seen how far such a compounding of their larceny, on a large scale, will disarm an opposition based, not simply on the principles of justice, but on motives also of self-interest. A nice balance of interests between such as wish to share the spoils of the monastic property is evidently the only principle on which the Government acts in this matter. In every aspect—social, political, and religious—the suppression of all the monasteries of Italy, and the confiscation of their property, cannot be contemplated by any Government without considerable anxiety and fear.

And then, to add difficulty to difficulty, comes the question how to deal



with Rome after the French troops, in pursuance of the convention of 15th of September, shall have withdrawn from the Papal territory. Victor Emmanuel, in his speech from the throne, declares that the fulness of time and the inevitable force of events will solve the differences pending between Italy and the Papacy. There appears no reason to doubt the King's assertion that the convention will be faithfully executed. After its execution, what then is to become of Rome? The journals in the interests of the French Emperor tell us that Napoleon has guaranteed to the Pope his civil sovereignty, and that Catholics may rest and be thankful. But such is not the language of the revolutionary journals. They see in the execution of the convention the triumph of the revolution and the downfall of the civil principedom of the Pope. How far are they wrong in their prognostications? The Pope, with his 600,000 subjects, is surrounded by the new kingdom which has, by a parliamentary vote never yet rescinded, declared Rome to be its capital. And Rome stands alone. Every kingdom, with the exception of Austria, has deserted its cause, and recognized the revolutionary kingdom of Italy. Spain, Bavaria, Saxony have sent their ambassadors to acknowledge Victor Emmanuel as king of the plundered States of the Church. Rome is thus cut off from the moral, as well as from the material support of Europe. The brigands are turned loose upon the Papal province of Frosinone, in order to make it appear that the Pope is unable to protect his own subjects, and therefore unfit to rule over the small portion of territory still left to him. And then, within the walls of Rome itself, the partizans of the revolution are secreted in great numbers, ready at a favourable moment to seize upon Rome and proclaim a Plebiscite. The world has grown too familiar of late with such acts of injustice and of transparent trickery to make us suppose that the annexation of Rome to Italy by a manœuvre of the secret societies would wound the moral sense of Europe. In Catholics, as well as in Protestants, the keen edge of loyal feeling has been somewhat blunted. Who now, comparatively speaking, cares about the position of the Pope alone among his enemies; at least, contrasted with the strong feeling displayed fifteen or sixteen years ago, not only by every Catholic who was worth his salt, but by a large portion of the Conservatives of Europe. Statesmen have grown tired of the Pope; and, as with individuals, so with nations, sympathy and interest too often dries up or dies out with the lapse of time. The only really keen interest manifested is that shown by his enemies. They are alive to every move, and watch every indication, so as to be able to turn every event to their own profit; they anxiously forecast the future. For instance, in allusion to the confidence (which we believe has already deceived Catholics far too often) that Napoleon will uphold the Pope in his civil principedom, the *Débats* says, "Let us admit the hypothesis of a revolution in Rome after the departure of our troops; and that the Romans know no better means of avoiding anarchy, and of enjoying a regular and stable authority than to annex themselves to Italy.

"In such a case what does the treaty of 15th September say? It says nothing; it is silent. What says M. Rouher? He affirms the Romans have not such a right without the *intervention* of Europe, an *intervention* that

means consent. Will Europe consent? The *Monde* says no; but such is not the declaration of M. Rouher. Europe, however, would never wish that Rome, deprived of the sovereignty of the Pope, should constitute itself a republic or create a new royal dynasty on behalf of some prince or banker of the eternal city? We are of opinion that Europe would prefer annexation, and that France would consent to it rather than intervene afresh to restore the temporal power of the Pope.\* To judge from his antecedent conduct in the Roman question there is nothing improbable in the supposition of the *Débats* as to the future policy of Napoleon towards the Papacy. In his famous letter of 31st December, 1859, Napoleon solemnly guarantees to the Pope the possession of his dominions, and yet the annexation was sanctioned by the French Government, and all intervention to prevent by force of arms this act of treachery and of violence was treated by Napoleon as a *casus belli*. "Who does not know," remarks the *Civiltà Cattolica*, "of the impetuous and persistent endeavours by which French diplomacy sought and obtained from all the European Powers the recognition of this act by which the Romagnas were withdrawn from the legitimate sovereignty of the Holy See?" Who then shall say, that what has been done, in spite of Imperial pledges and of solemn guarantees, in Umbria, the Marches, and the Romagnas, shall not also be done in Rome itself? It is true that M. Rouher, the Imperial Minister, declared in the Chambers "that the convention of 15th September creates, constitutes, and recognizes, as is obvious, two sovereignties—two separate existences; that it compels Italy to respect the Pontifical territory, and that the convention is understood by us in the sense of the continual co-existence of the two sovereignties. We, indeed, must leave Rome within two years, but Italy must always respect the Pontifical territory and not permit it to be assailed." Very grave and distinct promises, nothing could be better as far as words go. But were not the integrity of the Pontifical dominions and the inviolability of all the sovereign rights of the Holy Father guaranteed by all the material and moral power of the French empire? And to what purpose? Has not Pius IX. been despoiled of four-fifths of his territories? Did not Napoleon himself declare, "We do not go into Italy to foment disorder, nor to shake the power of the Holy Father, whom we have brought back to his throne"? Did not M. Baroche, in the name of the Emperor, declare in the Chambers, "that the Government would take every necessary precaution to secure the safety and independence of the Holy Father in the midst of the agitation which might arise in Italy," that "the Government would cause to be respected, whatever might happen, the independence and the States of the Holy See." On the 30th of April, M. Baroche, the President of the Council, gave in the face of France these assurances, and in June the Romagnas were taken away from the Pope.†

Judging of the future by the past, relying on the long course of broken pledges and of violated guarantees, seeing the *Kingdom of Italy* recognized

---

\* *Journal des Débats*, 15th November.

† *Civiltà Cattolica*.

by almost all the European Powers, seeing the Pope isolated from his friends and surrounded by his enemies, the revolution looks with Victor Emmanuel to "the fulness of time and the inevitable force of events," for the successful conclusion of the eventful drama. At the same time it restricts itself in obedience to the Convention to the use of *moral means* only. What these moral means are we learn from the secret instructions issued by the *Roman National Committee*. The substance of this document, referred to by the *Osservatore Romano* of 10th of November, and whose authenticity it affirms, may be summed up thus:—First. To oppose every movement which has not received its impulse from the Government of Florence. Secondly. Not to give any tokens of gratification at the departure of the French troops, as such conduct might destroy confidence in the validity of the guarantees given by France. Thirdly. Not to grow weary of befouling, in the most unhesitating manner, more than he is already befouled, the priest who governs Rome; therefore, create a hubbub by means of a well-contrived correspondence and by the secret press, by brigandage, by corrupt administration, by general imputations, and such like means, without minding their falsehood. Fourthly. Avoid embarrassing the Government of Florence; be not disheartened if, to save appearances, it should be constrained to disapprove and even to act the part of being innocent of machinations against Rome, and put down successful attempts in order to show to France that the Emperor has not agreed to them. Fifthly. Aim at corrupting the native, and striking terror into the foreign, troops that are in the service of the Pope. But lastly, affect always the greatest respect for the person of the Pope, for order, for property, for liberty of opinions, and for religion.

Such are some of the moral means to be used against the civil sovereignty of the Pope. He is to be hemmed in on all sides, his Government abused and calumniated; corruption, treachery, and intimidation are to do their worst. And when the final catastrophe arrives, to which all these means tend, Napoleon will protest to the Catholic world that he is guiltless of all share in this evil deed, unmindful that he it was who initiated the revolution in Italy, who sanctioned the seizure of the States of the Church, and, barring the way against the Catholic powers of Europe, surrounded the Papal throne with his troops until the revolution had consolidated its strength, and the chance of resistance in Rome and in Catholic Europe had gradually been reduced to its minimum; and that, then, withdrawing his troops, he chose to leave Rome defenceless a prey to the revolution. From such a catastrophe, humanly-speaking, there appears no escape, unless the collapse of the revolutionary kingdom anticipate the course of things; or unless some Christian statesman of commanding power should arise in time to save his country by strangling the revolution on the eve of its victory, and by leading repentant Italy back to Rome.

If things look bad and threatening in Italy, yet that unhappy country does not monopolize all the craft and audacity of the revolution. A large share of its activity is now bestowed on Spain. There is such a homogeneity in these revolutionary movements, that the method we have seen pursued with such success in Italy describes precisely what is taking place in

Spain. Masonic lodges, revolutionary committees, a Democratic press, calumny, abuse, bribery, are the means employed by the revolutionary party, and they are directed, as in Italy against the Pope, so in Spain against the Queen, as the representative of Catholicism, and of the established order of things. Old scandals of the court, which ought by this time to have been forgotten and forgiven, are revived, and new are invented. No insinuation is too vile, no accusation too gross, to be levelled against the unhappy Queen. Soldiers and ex-ministers are the chief leaders of the revolution in the Spanish peninsula; the immediate object of the present conspiracy is to drive by force or by fear the Queen from her throne. The prospect of establishing an "Iberian empire," which a twelvemonth ago we alluded to as having been just concocted in the Masonic lodges of Lisbon, in agreement with the revolutionists of Spain, has already shown its character in the abortive attempt of General Prim.

To make the people of Spain familiar with such an idea is the first object with these conspirators. Had it not been for the unpopularity of the Queen, at least in Madrid and the commercial cities, it would have been impossible to even broach so disloyal a project. The revolutionists, however, have skillfully turned to their account various circumstances, such as the commercial distress and the financial embarrassments of Spain, its foreign embroilments, and even the absence of the Court from Madrid during the cholera, which have tended to make the Queen unpopular. On a former occasion we had spoken of the growing disloyalty in the Press, and even in the Chambers, and of the anti-dynastic character of the movement. This character has since been more strongly marked not only by General Prim's unsuccessful revolt, but by the absence of the Progressista party since the late elections from the Chambers, and by the reasons which they alleged to be the cause of such abstention. The election of Espartero, in whom anarchy and irreligion are personified, to the presidency of the Progressista Committee betrays the lengths to which this party is prepared to go. The letter in which he declined the presidency, although fully agreeing in the policy of the party, was the letter of a traitor to the royal lady whose commission he bears. The Progressista party, which has raised what it calls the standard of Democracy, has gathered up all the discontented or ambitious sections of Spanish politicians; it abstains from the Chambers; it refuses to seek a parliamentary remedy for the grievances, which it complains of, in the government and constitution of the country; it seeks, by agitating the popular mind, and by bringing the constitution and the dynasty into contempt, to force things to a dead lock. By means of the revolutionary generals it seeks to corrupt the army, and induce a series of those military revolts too common in Spain. It inflames the populace in the capital and in the great commercial cities against the dynasty and against the ecclesiastical influence which, it pretends, surrounds the Queen. In a word, these fomentors of anarchy describe the Catholic and the Royalist party, which objected to the weak and miserable concessions forced on the Queen by O'Donnell, as a camarilla governing the country in the name of the Queen. This party have publicly proclaimed, and continue to proclaim, that the recognition of Italy, liberalism, progress, com-

mercial prosperity, electoral reform, sale of the ecclesiastical property, secularisation of national education, freedom of all religious opinions, could never be executed or permanently secured to Spain as long as the present dynasty exists, because the Queen was so much under ecclesiastical influence, that she would be sure to repent of any concessions wrung from her in the hour of danger. As long as the principles of Catholicism and the authority of the Queen are paramount, these men see no hope for Spain, no possibility for her entering upon the path of "modern civilization," or of enjoying "modern liberties." They appeal therefore to the streets; they inflame the passions of the people, if they do not even indirectly invoke the dagger of the assassin. Such are the remedies of an infuriate minority, which rejects "with patriotic disdain," all constitutional remedies. What a close resemblance do not these masonic and revolutionary societies bear to each other? how like is their language. There is a veritable Freemasonry in their terms. Espartero and General Prim are fac-similes of Mazzini and Garibaldi; and in Prim's intrigues with the soldiery and revolt reappear the hypocrisy and treason of Garibaldi.

In reading the Progressista manifesto we hear the echo of Mazzini's voice. Let us extract some passages from this audacious document. It says:—

"The Central Committee do not disguise the critical circumstances through which Spain is now passing. To them neither the disquietude of the public mind, the discredit of our securities, nor the distressed condition of commerce and manufactures—sad legacy of Conservative Administrations—are mysteries . . . .

"The Progressista party will not abandon their abstention. Theocratic influence is still prevalent in high quarters, and things are to-day what they were yesterday, what they have always been, and will be to-morrow, so long as a radical change does not take place in the political foundation upon which they rest. The new electoral law is a concession, but a concession that in the exercise of the law will be converted into a sarcasm . . . .

"With municipalities enslaved and the administration centralized, the press subjected to the jealousy of a prejudiced censorship, the coffers of the Treasury exhausted, the ecclesiastical liquidation unprofitable and its proceeds misapplied, the laws that formerly restrained the extravagancies of the clergy now disregarded, parliamentary doctrine fallen into desuetude, public debt increasing, national securities excluded from the money markets, the sources of wealth exhausted, manufactures paralyzed, insufficient though excessive taxes, agriculture without protection, the bloody memory of the nights of the 10th of April and the 3rd of October, and charity—queen of the virtues—going to the poor man's hearth with tender soul and bountiful hand—with all this there is no reason whatever for the Progressista party to give up the efficacious protest of its patriotic disdain.

"And in this the Central Committee do not follow their own convictions, but pursue the path traced by the prophetic words of the manifesto of the 28th of October, 1864. If the property of the country be dissipated, if bankruptcy terminate our financial difficulties, if at length the edifice raised

and supported by us with such sacrifices should fall, and traditional obstacles—always incompatible with liberal ideas—should lend their force to the subterranean currents of reaction, we shall tranquilly look on with folded arms at the breaking-up of an organization once vigorous, but now destroyed by the scandal of its vices—we shall save nothing from the wreck but the banner of our principles, the treasure of our belief—Spanish dignity.

“Melancholy condition for a nation when, by the fault of those who govern it, the people are placed between shame and peril—between misfortune and revolution. They give what is asked of them, and are denied in return even the holy legitimacy of their indisputable sovereignty.

“The thirst for power in the Conservative groups is boundless, and despises public opinion as weak and powerless, but public opinion exercises, in our day, a mysterious dictatorship, which does not need the magisterial robe, nor the torch of insurrection, nor the axe of the executioner, to secure on a solid basis the conquests of modern civilization. It matters not that the present Administration seeks support in an electoral oligarchy, that it endeavours to convert the religious feeling of the people into an element hostile to sentiments of humanity, that it traffics with the dealers who surround it, and lies in wait for an opportunity to re-establish the superstitions of theocracy and the traditional prerogatives of absolute monarchies—public opinion, when it is not a torch that dissipates this dark cloud of bygone ages, is a flame that kindles in the hearts of the people the fruitful and regenerating spirit of revolutions.

“The remedy for so many evils is not in the hands of the Central Committee, neither would they say what the clouds now accumulating and darkening upon the political horizon may bring.

“If the winds are unchained, and if, at length, the tempest bursts forth, the fault will be with those who received government as a mine to be worked for their own profit, of those who reject as absurd and punish as impious the natural demands of human reason.

“The expansive and civilizing spirit of the age, reflected in its purity, in the Progressista party, tends to strengthen the bonds between all nations . . .

“The Progressista party aspires to the accomplishment of liberty in all its manifestations . . . it demands liberty of written thought, inviolability of conscience, complete secularization of national education, the right of public meeting, and the constitution of 1856 as a point of departure.” It was in answer to this revolutionary and irreligious manifesto that General Espartero wrote thus:—“Your estimable Committee may be assured that to defend the *liberties and the constitutional throne to which they refer*, they may always reckon upon my heart and arm.” But it is not in defence of Queen Isabella’s dynasty that Espartero promises his sword, for hers is not the constitutional throne the Progressista party refer to. They are pledged to its overthrow, as well as to the destruction of the Church, of the State, and of the nation. The return of the Queen to her capital was to have been the occasion of a revolutionary demonstration which might easily have led to one of those sudden revolutions which have characterized modern Spain. But O’Donnell, to his credit be it said, had massed troops in great force at Madrid, and had



declared that, although he had allowed the utmost licence of speech, he would punish instantaneously and with unflinching severity the slightest attempt at an outbreak or a disturbance in the streets. O'Donnell was known to be a soldier who would not scruple to use the force at his command. This resolution had the desired effect. A great outcry was raised at the extraordinary display of military force at Madrid, and the people were warned—that is to say, the revolutionary party, who in every country assume to themselves the name of the people—that the Government were eager of an opportunity of renewing the bloodshed of last April, and, therefore, to abstain from a dangerous manifestation of their just anger and discontent.

The reception of the Queen was ominous: the state of public feeling in Madrid, kept in continual excitement by the revolutionary electoral committee of the capital, shows the extent and influence of the subversive party. The communistic tendencies of some of the large cities, the growth of religious indifference in the commercial classes, the influence of foreign revolutionary propagandism, and the underhand support of the natural enemies of the last Bourbon dynasty, all tend to give confidence to the revolutionary party. Though the honorary presidency has been given to Espartero, Prim, the favourite of the army, was the real and dangerous leader. A Catalanian by birth, he has been all his life a soldier of the revolution. Within a twelvemonth—he has been recalled to Spain, he has taken up arms against his queen, and was sentenced to the death of a traitor. The recognition of Italy under such circumstances was a concession to the revolution as dangerous to the state as it was unworthy of the Catholic loyalty of Spain. It has stimulated the appetite of the revolutionary party, as the taste of blood does that of the wolf. O'Donnell has seriously compromised his reputation by such an act, induced, it is said, by his alliance with the "Liberal Union," a half-way party, and his desire to conciliate their support. But this meeting half way, especially when we are moving under an enemy's eye, is a most treacherous expedient. In political as well as religious questions, it is a perilous weakness to exchange the high ground of right for a questionable border-land of our own finding. It will, however, take a great deal of secret work, of bribery and corruption, to shake the faith and loyalty of the Spanish nation. Much has already been done to spread indifferentism among the people: a common danger at least ought to inspire a great deal more of zeal among some of the clergy, and induce stricter discipline and a better system of clerical training. Spain has happily been delivered from many evils; but the enemy, under the guise of modern civilization, is very subtle, and steals often almost unawares into the mind and into the heart of a people. But from an unexpected source, as welcome as it is unusual, a testimony has come as to the unselfish courage and heroic charity of the Spanish and of the Catholic character.

The correspondent of the *Times* in Spain, speaking of the fearful ravages of the cholera at Madrid, says that "although the evil has really been great, and the fear still greater, in Madrid, there has been, nevertheless, as I have been assured, no lack of generous disregard of personal safety, of unflinching discharge of duty, of dauntless devotion of man to man. Many, I may say

most, of those who could do any good by staying, did not turn their backs upon the dire enemy, and charity and true piety have shone with all that lustre which is characteristic of southern countries, and it must be said in sober truth, of Roman Catholic communities. It is the one redeeming point in a clergy with whom it is so easy to find fault in other respects."

For the sake of this tribute to truth, we can forgive the sneer with which the writer alludes to the faults of a clergy of which he has no personal knowledge, but of which he speaks under the compulsion of what F. Newman calls the great Protestant tradition. It would indeed be a calamity if a nation endowed like Spain with so many noble attributes, so celebrated for its loyalty and Catholicism, and so long preserved from the taint of heresy, should now, at last, fall a victim to the political and religious rationalism of the age. But the dangerous and compromising character of O'Donnell's Government has roused the latent antagonism of the Catholic populations in the rural districts, and especially in the Basque provinces, as was manifest in the late elections; and the prelates of Spain, when occasion offers, will know how to assert in the Senate the dignity of the Crown, and the rights of the Church and of the Papacy, against the attacks and concessions of a weak, if not corrupt, ministry. The future of Spain, at this momentous crisis, is in the hands of the Catholic and Royalist majority of the nation.

The death of the King of the Belgians for a moment concentrated public attention to the little kingdom, lying between two such unscrupulous neighbours as France and Prussia. Annexation, an idea with which Cavour and Louis Napoleon have made Europe familiar, is now ominously repeated as one of the contingencies which may befall the kingdom created by the revolution of 1830. Though Bismark may be bent on consolidating Germany after the fashion of Cavour, and Napoleon, in case of such successful annexations, may be reluctantly constrained to rectify the frontiers of France by an appropriation of some of the Flemish provinces, we do not think the partition of Belgium probable, unless Belgium be untrue to itself. Its internal dissensions are Belgium's greatest danger. These dissensions are grave and deep-seated. It is no ephemeral difference, but one of principle, which divides Belgium into two hostile camps,—into two antagonistic parties,—Catholic and Infidel. The Infidel party—supported by the Government, and nourished by the State universities of Ghent and Liege, as well by the Masonic university of Brussels—have been growing in numbers and influence, until they make it a boast, that for the last five or six years the country has invariably refused to place the government in the hands of the Catholic party. Emboldened by this success, the Liberal party lose no opportunity of invading the rights of the Church and of trenching on the liberty of education. In no country is this party spirit so virulent as in Belgium. The late King, whose sympathies were with the anti-Catholic section, was able to moderate the violence of the Liberals, and restrain their unconstitutional proceedings. But the present King, however much he may keep aloof, as he declares to be his intention, "from the conflict of opinions, leaving the country itself to decide between them," will not escape the suspicion of, as a good Catholic, giving his moral influence, at the very least, to the support of Catholicism against the

aggression of Infidelity. The Liberal party cannot brook defeat, nor submit to its consequences in a constitutional manner. The Catholics of Belgium have experienced their illegal violence on various occasions. Their turbulent opponents have before now appealed to street riots. Should the Liberal party chance to be beaten, as is not unlikely, since Catholics who have been forced in self-defence to organize a formidable opposition, may now think it their duty to displace their opponents, and were the King to give his confidence and support to a Catholic Government, enjoying a majority in the Chambers, it would not be long, we fancy, before Belgium would be distracted by Republican plots and anti-Royal conspiracies. Already, such threats are not wanting; a Belgian Liberal, writing to the *Daily News*, in anticipation of the unpopularity which a Catholic King, really devoted to the Church, may expect from his party, says:—"The new King's popularity would receive a fatal blow if he attempted in any way to favour the ecclesiastical influence." He then describes the Church to which the King belongs, "as nothing but a grasping and tyrannical priesthood;" and lest people should be mistaken as to the views of the Liberal party, he tells them that "Belgium is a Democracy with a Royal president;" or more explicit still, that "Opinion fills the throne and is the real sovereign."

The democratic character of the Belgian monarchy, as well as the godless character of the Constitution of 1830, is, it is true, an undoubted danger to Belgium's existence as a separate and independent nation. The State recognizes no religion; the King of the Belgians is not "the anointed" of the Lord. His crown is not consecrated and put on his head by the hand of the Church: he is made king only by the ceremony of swearing to the Constitution in the presence of both Chambers. His kingship wants, therefore, the supreme consecration of religion. In the day of trial the Liberals, we fear, will treat their king as an elective President, to be set aside if found obnoxious to the instincts of Belgian Liberalism. But to know what stuff this Belgian Liberalism is made of, one must read its newspapers and its publications, attend its meetings, follow its funeral processions when a Masonic brother like Vanhaegen, who has died boasting of his infidelity, is carried to his grave, and listen to the orations it pronounces over his body. If a man has never realized what public blasphemy and infidelity are, after being present on such occasions, he will need no further explanation. Or, worse still, perhaps, let him attend the Congresses which are annually held for the purpose of enlightening or regenerating the world, and he will be astonished at the infamous lengths to which the infidel party in Belgium go in their attempt at demoralizing the people, especially the young among the educated classes. One of such Congresses, called the "Students' Congress," was held towards the end of October at Liège—the seat of one of the State universities—and was followed by another at Brussels. The students of the avowed infidel university at Brussels and of the State university of Ghent, as well as those of Liège, attended these meetings. These discussions lasted for days; and doctrines and opinions of the most anti-social and atheistical character were uttered, and welcomed with vociferous applause.

Revolution was proclaimed as queen of the world, Socialism was preached,

and the red flag was hailed as the standard of the future. Regret was expressed that Julian the apostate had not triumphed over Christianity, and thus anticipated by fourteen hundred years the institutions of the French Revolution. One gentleman, we are told, M. Fontaine, of Liège, courageously rose to protest in favour of the existence of God, but he was tumultuously cried down and silenced.\* One of the most applauded of the speakers at the Congress spoke as follows :—"Two ideas, two principles, have governed the world,—the divine principle and the human principle. The first belongs to the past ; the second will rule the future. It is a conflict between God and man. There are not more than two real governments possible ; the one, because it was divine, we sent on the 21st of January (the day of the execution of Louis XVI.) to rejoin Heaven ; the other is the Revolution, socialism. In the domain of reason we will have no God ; in social life no authority. Our young men are revolutionists, socialists, atheists ; and they make a boast of it. Our men are the men of '93 ; Dunton, Saint-Just, Marat ; and our teachers, why, they are Edgar Quinet, Comte, and Proudhon. Our flag is the red flag—is the flag which ought to float here." This speaker was one of those seven students from Paris whose presence at this Belgian Congress has brought down upon them perpetual expulsion from the University of Paris, and given a world-wide notoriety to these Congresses of Belgian Liberalism and infidelity. But the Belgian government and university-authorities, unlike those of France, sanction these atrocious meetings. The burgomaster of Liège opened the Congress by speaking of its members "as the most worthy and the most accredited representatives of all the principles of social welfare," and added that "between us all there exists a perfect reciprocity of ideas and sentiments." This is Belgian reciprocity and solidarity with a vengeance ! Another of these blasphemous and unprincipled students of the Paris University said in the course of his speech ; "we are revolutionists, socialists, atheists ! There is another Congress which we hasten on with all our efforts, and which will be of a far different kind from that of Liège,—it will be held in the streets, and our guns shall be its conclusion."

Another said : "Citizens, I call upon you for an oath. Are we not men ? well, then, let us swear hate to the bourgeoisie, hate to capital ; let us assert the right of labour, or, rather, of labourers ! Let us unite ! let us rally round the red flag, which a poet dashed to the ground in other times, understanding but too well that the red flag is ever an appeal to arms. In 1830 and in 1848 the people were not generous, but simply dupes. The question now is whether we are to continue slaves any longer."

It is not to be forgotten that these speeches are not uttered in the secret meetings of a Masonic club, but in a public Congress held in a university town in the presence and with the sanction of the chief magistrate of the city. Another speaker at this Congress of Belgian Liberals and infidels uttered words so atrociously blasphemous, such as no public assembly out of Belgium or of Paris in its worst days would have tolerated, far less welcomed and applauded. It is the language of 1793 uttered in cold blood ; it is the

---

\* *Katholik-Kirchliche Rundschau*—Mainz.

*mystery* whispered in the Masonic lodge: "People," says this atrocious blasphemer, speaking publicly in a Congress of Belgian Liberals, and State-university students, and strangers from Paris—"People, you are deceived. The idea of God stifles, strangles, degrades you. For the six thousand years that this idea has held you in its mighty claws, what has it given you but misery, prostitution, and shame? Shake off the wretched yoke, and of your own strength crush under foot the Colossus which you have placed in heaven. Alone, isolated, we can do nothing yet, but hate, curse, and calumniate. Aid us and triumph, and you shall see an era shine forth of light, of happiness, and of liberty." Such frantic blasphemies are but echoes from the Hall of Pilate. Yet such atrocities spoken or applauded are specimens of the character of Belgian Liberalism and of the sort of men which godless universities, in the course of a single generation, have produced in a country so Catholic as Belgium. Can we be surprised at the Pope's condemning education, such as that bestowed in Belgium, or at the anxiety which good Catholics exhibit in all parts of the world to put down Liberalism in education? Side by side with this rank and furious infidelity in Belgium stands a firm and zealous Catholicism; courageous, loyal, true to the Pope, outspoken in the defence of the dogmas, of the rights and of the liberties of the Church, ready to do battle to the uttermost. Is it possible to suppose, if Catholics triumph in the country, that the men of the stamp we have seen and heard in the Liberal and Masonic Congresses—godless, unrestrained, and desperate—would not fly to revolution as a means of upsetting a triumphant Church and a Catholic throne. Government in the hands of the Liberals only—a throne ruled on Masonic principles or vacant, religion the slave of the State or persecuted and gagged—such is the creed of the Liberals. If this is not to be had and kept, why then down with kings and priests, and make Belgium a godless republic? In such a contingency, who does not see the danger of annexation? But this danger does not come from the Catholics and Conservatives of Belgium, but from the Liberals and infidels,—they are the real traitors to their king and to their country.

If we turn our attention from Belgium—Belgium which is the world in miniature—where all the great questions of the age awaiting solution find their place; and where, if the stage be small, the actors on it are in earnest—to Paris, we shall see how, as surely as water finds its level, a wild and godless Liberalism finds its consummation in a military despotism. If Liberalism has cost France its liberty, Belgium, as she loves freedom, ought to take warning in time. Its government and university authorities would do well to imitate, however, in this the example of France, and repress and punish such manifestations of anarchy and atheism as those that are made in the Liberal Congresses. Wisely have the French academic authorities punished the seven students, who went to the Liège Congress, by perpetual exclusion from the University of Paris. Wiser still would it be to alter the irreligious character of the education given in the public schools of France, and then no such commotion as has lately agitated the *Quartier Latin*—the classic ground of Paris riots—and no such sympathy, as is now

shown towards such offenders against religion and public order as the seven expelled students, would then disturb or startle the public mind. 'Symptoms are not wanting to show that the demon of irreligious anarchy is not dead in France, but only chained; and, if they were not so terribly visible as they are, the circumstances of the death and funeral of M. Bixio—the life-long Apostle of Republicanism and unbelief—would point in that direction. M. Bixio was that deputy who, on the 2nd of December, was arrested on his way to the printer's with the resolution deposing the Prince President; he was an accomplice of Cavour's in the Italian Revolution; he was the brother of General Bixio of Garibaldian notoriety; and, finally, he was a familiar of Prince Napoleon's. He denied God in death as in life; and this ostentatious rejection of religion at such a moment is not the least of his merits in the eyes of the irreligious journals of France. One writer observes that his end resembled that of Socrates; and the *Sicde* pompously relates that, feeling his end approaching, he called about him his friends for the last time, and, in the fashion of the Stoics, bade them farewell in the most touching manner. And the *Opinion Nationale* adds:—"Bixio died in the perfect consciousness of his condition, after calling about him his family and his friends, to show them how a great man can die, without having recourse to any minister of religion. He ordered that his body should be conveyed, without pomp of any sort, straight to the grave-yard. During this touching scene all wept; he, alone, exhibited the serenity of mind of the sages of antiquity." Conspicuously foremost in the funeral procession which conveyed this unhappy man to his grave, was Prince Napoleon. At the same hour as the marriage of his cousin, Princess Murat, with the legitimist Duke de Mouchy was taking place in the presence of the Emperor at the chapel of the Tuileries, Prince Napoleon was paying public homage in the streets of Paris to Republicanism and atheism.

Whatever influence he may exercise in private, in political matters silence has been imposed upon the injudicious cousin of the Emperor. In the Senate we miss his usual tirade against the Papacy; the Roman question, we suppose, in the opinion of the French Government, requires at the present juncture a more delicate manipulation than it was likely to receive at his hands. The policy of Napoleon as regards Rome, since the commencement of the year which is to witness the execution of the September Convention, is managed by its characteristic duplicity. As an evidence of this policy, we refer to the despatch of Baron de Malaret, the French Minister at the Florentine court; to M. Drouyn de Lhuys, the Emperor's speech, and to the damaging revelations of the Spanish Red Book.

Baron de Malaret insists as against the Italian government on the extent of the obligations, henceforth irrevocable, incurred by Italy in the Convention of September, and from which no Government would be able to withdraw in any case or upon any pretext. He points out the danger, owing to the insufficiency or uncertainty of the majority in the Chambers, of power passing into revolutionary hands; or, as the French Minister euphemistically phrases it, into more recently Conservative hands than those of the present government, and thus the execution of the engagements contracted by the



Convention of the 15th of September might one day be intrusted to the men who have always combated that act; and Malaret, moreover, reminds General La Marmora that, in spite of the agreement established upon this subject in diplomatic documents, the language of the Italian press and of certain Italian statesmen had put an equivocal interpretation on this treaty; and therefore, to avoid all future misconceptions of its meaning, he defines its scope and sense in the three following propositions:—

"1. That, contrary to what is daily printed by the Italian press (irrespective of the Government, it is, of course, understood), we had intended, by signing the convention of September 15th, to secure the co-existence in Italy of two distinct sovereignties—that of the Pope reduced to the proportions it now occupies, and that of the kingdom of Italy.

"2. That those terms of moral means, which have been somewhat abused, signify in our eyes persuasion, the spirit of conciliation, the influence of moral and material interests, and lastly, the effect of time which, by calming passions, must some day cause to disappear the obstacles that have hitherto opposed the reconciliation of an eminently Catholic power with the chief of Catholicity.

"3. Lastly: that, in all eventualities not foreseen by the convention, France has formally reserved to herself the most absolute liberty of action, without any kind of restriction."

The same view on the Roman question is taken by the speech from the throne. "We are to rely," says the Emperor at the opening of the legislature, "upon the scrupulous execution of the treaty of the 15th of September, and upon the indispensable maintenance of the power of the Holy Father." To remove the doubt that lurked in the Imperial speech as to the precise meaning attached to the power, the maintenance of which was declared indispensable, the address in answer to the speech inserted the word "temporal" before power, thus re-asserting, with greater precision and emphasis, as indispensable the maintenance of the temporal power of the Pope. As declarations of a policy, nothing could be more satisfactory than these public statements from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, from the throne itself, and from the Chamber; but as to the honesty or, at least, as to the consistency of these public statements, the most damaging revelations have been made by the Spanish Red Book. In this record of diplomatic conversations and of official explanations the view on the Roman question, and the line of policy indicated by M. Drouyn de Lhuys to the Spanish minister, are in startling contradiction to the views and policy publicly avowed. The continuance of the support given and promised by France to the temporal Power is clogged with offensive or impossible conditions. The Spanish minister is told that, if Rome continues to refuse to make concessions to modern ideas, France will not be responsible for the consequences; or that, if the reforms which France herself has so often urged are still obstinately refused, her assistance cannot reasonably be expected against the disturbances which such a refusal may provoke; in a word, "that, if Rome choose to commit suicide, France cannot help it."

In this Spanish Red Book, whose publication has caused no small

consternation in more quarters than one, we find a despatch directed to the Spanish ambassador at Rome, in which M. Bermudez de Castro expresses the hope that the detached Papal provinces may, in process of time, be restored to Rome.

The expression of this hope excited the ire of the Italian minister. General de la Marmora addressed in reply a rather dictatorial remonstrance to the Spanish Government, deprecating its interference in the arrangements of the convention of the 15th of September—a treaty which alone concerns France and Italy. He takes the same opportunity also of declaring, in reference to the most regrettable observations of the Spanish minister, the irrevocable determination of the Italian Government to cause the unity of Italy to be respected. Such a despatch, as may well be imagined, called forth an answer from the Spanish minister, in which he firmly maintains the right of Spain, as of every Catholic country, to intervene on the behalf of the temporal power of the Pope, in which all Catholic countries were alike interested; moreover, he asserted, Spain, as well as the rest of Catholic Europe, was entitled to be informed as to whatever steps were taken, by treaty or otherwise, such as were calculated to affect the permanence or safety of the temporal power of the Papacy. Such newly-vowed friends as Spain and Italy do not appear to have inaugurated their unhappy alliance much to their mutual satisfaction. Nations, like individuals, when they get off the old grooves, are not apt to take much by their inconsistency—a little flattery for a time at the cost of respect and esteem that were lasting. But not only in the Spanish Red Book are damaging revelations made as to the consistency of French diplomacy. In his famous circular, recently published, Cardinal Antonelli traces with unerring eye the sinuous windings of French policy on the Roman question, and draws out, with the hand of a master, the necessary and fatal consequences that await the not distant issue of such a line of conduct. He tears aside all the sophistries that have been wrapped round the Roman question, and traces with ruthless logic consequences back to their causes, and fixes the responsibility of all the evils to come on him who is the author of the present state of things. With the calmness and the precision of an historian, the Papal Secretary of State narrates the sequence of events, and points to the inevitable conclusion. They who wish to know the real bearing and tendency of French policy in Italy ought to make themselves familiar with Cardinal Antonelli's statement of facts; but they who wish to avoid the truth must, like the *Times*, avert their eyes from this great State-paper. Antonelli's despatch to the Papal nuncios, like the dismissal of the Russian ambassador from his presence on account of his offensive observations as to Catholicism in Poland, are striking evidences of the courage of the Holy Father, and of his confidence in the justice of his cause.

The question of greatest interest in the home politics of France, and one which cannot fail eventually to affect the foreign relations of the country and the interests of Catholicity, is the gradual development in the Chambers, as in the country, of a constitutional opposition known under the name of the *parti tiers*. This party accepts loyally the Napoleonic dynasty, but

opposes its despotic principles of government. M. Guizot has wisely said that universal suffrage is the enemy of liberty. In France, as in Italy, there is abundant evidence to show that universal suffrage has been made an instrument to inflict no slight injury on the nation. For what can be a graver injury than for a people continually to live under the tutelage of a despotic government—the too natural offspring of universal suffrage—universal in the masculine discipline of self-government; devoted with all its energies to the pursuit of mere material interests, on the one hand, or absorbed, on the other, in a vortex of unexampled luxury and profligate living. The energies of a nation, and especially of such a nation as the French, must have vent; but if all healthy outlets, such as are provided for an intellectual people in political life, are barred up by a jealous ruler, they will spend themselves on pursuits and objects as unworthy of a free as they are degrading to a Christian people. The whole policy of the empire consists in seeking to provide a compensating balance to the people for the loss of their liberty. And what a compensation! Liberty is denied to the press and to Parliament, but licentiousness is not only permitted, but encouraged in the light literature and on the stage. It is like the living under the lower empire; a more than Byzantine luxury is but too sure to be followed,—symptoms of which are already but too conspicuous in Parisian society—by a worse than Byzantine degradation. Keenly alive to this moral evil, and passionately attached to political liberty, the “*parti tiers*” is grappling on constitutional grounds with imperialism. We shall be curious to watch the issue of a struggle the small beginnings of which we are now witnessing. It is hard to say on what principle the party rests, since it is composed of men of every variety of opinion, unless on the broad ground of common resistance to the despotic maxims of imperialism and of a common love of liberty. In this sense the party proposed an amendment to the address, which, after a significant debate, was rejected. The famous minority of forty-six on this division had increased to sixty-three. Such a gradual growth of a party under leaders of no common parliamentary power cannot have escaped the notice of the Emperor, and cannot fail to influence the imperial policy of the future.

If the debates in the Lower Chamber have had more than common significance, a recent discussion in the Senate on the state of Protestantism in France is not without interest. The occasion of the discussion was a petition presented to the Government by M. de Coninck for a restoration of synodal action in the Reformed Church. In order to stop the ravage of the errors which, according to his petition, was desolating the Reformed Church, he desired to see established “in that Church a superior and regulating authority invested with the right and the power of fixing in an unchangeable manner the faith of that Church, and of establishing its discipline on bases which all pastors and flock alike should be bound to observe.” The principle of this petition, however, was scouted by the opponents of the petitioner as opposed to the fundamental principle of Protestantism, namely, private judgment and free inquiry. In the course of the debate, M. Rouland described the state of Protestantism in France thus:—“All the world knows that, for some time past, the reformed religion has been a prey to the deepest dissensions, which

owe their origin to the critical and historical works of Germany on the divinity of Our Lord and on the sacred Scriptures." After alluding to the analogy which existed between religious and democratic Protestantism, the speaker said he would, if he were allowed, define the doctrines of the new Reformation which represented the advanced party of Protestantism. "These," he said, "are the doctrines : man has but two methods of knowing, and of judging of ideas—conscience and reason. Hence the supernatural ought to be rejected as irreconcilable with reason. Hence dogmas, mysteries, miracles, cannot be the basis of a progressive religion. Hence, without ceasing to be a Christian, men may believe neither in original sin, nor in the Trinity, nor in eternal punishments, nor in the Redemption, nor in the Incarnation, nor in the Resurrection. He may thus, without ceasing to be a Christian, deny the divinity of Christ, and the authority of the Scriptures."

It is true, in the holy and pious life of Jesus Christ, people may find a model of all that is just and good ; but they must not go beyond that. Such are the teachings of "Liberal Protestantism." This whole discussion, so descriptive of the present state of Protestantism in France, has been carefully avoided by the English Press. Even the courageous and sympathetic *Daily News* does not venture more than to devote but a few scanty lines to the subject. The *Times*, as it did Cardinal Antonelli's circular, passes this discussion in the French Senate over in complete silence. We therefore are the more bound, in this Review, to call attention to the matter. At any rate it cannot be uninteresting to hear the description which Mr. Rouland gives of a clergyman who enjoys in the ranks of Protestantism a certain authority, and who has great talent as a writer. In one of his works, M. Bosc, for such is his name, thus expounds, according to M. Rouland's statement in the Senate, the idea of the new reformation, "All religious doctrine is subject to the interpretation of reason and conscience." "The dogmatic work of the Fathers of the Reformation has to be revised from top to bottom." "Moral and religious principles have to adapt themselves to new forms." Pastor Bosc believes "that he is perfectly at liberty to admit neither the infallibility of Scripture nor the divinity of Christ." "Reason may accept that which it approves of in Scripture." "Jesus Christ has founded a religion which shall not pass away ; but the idea of the supernatural is not His work ; it is even in contradiction with all that we know of Him." Further, "Christ is our like and our brother. He is degraded rather than elevated by the theory which deifies Him. Christianity is bound up with Jesus Christ ; but if it be said that He is the Son of God, that He is the son of a virgin, that He is risen again, the author answers that it is possible, but that on such affirmations the conscience is incompetent to pronounce."

"Such," said M. Rouland to the Senate of France, "is what the new Reformation thinks of the divinity of Christ." "But," he continues, "these doctrines are not met with only in books—in books published by pastors who are performing their functions and in the pay of the State, but they are openly professed in the pulpit." The speaker mentioned that the question as to the resurrection of Christ was put in a consistorial conference at Paris, and

no fewer than fifty-five out of four hundred Protestant clergymen declared against the doctrine of the resurrection : they resolved that Jesus Christ was to be regarded as a great man, but that it was futile to see in him a God. The President of the Senate, M. Bonjean, in reply, declined to interfere in the matter of the petition, on the ground that the Senate, as a political power, was not competent to judge, in matters of faith, as to what was true or false. "As a Catholic," he said, "I do not recognize in any civil power the right to say, to-day, that my faith is true ; because that would be recognizing its right to say, to-morrow, that it was false." Considering that Protestantism rested on the principle of free inquiry, he thought, that the very divisions in that community were so many proofs that the reformed Christians had remained faithful to their standard ; and as to the measure proposed by the petitioner to bring about unity of faith and discipline in the Protestant community, he held them to be utterly futile. What would be the result, he asked. For instance there are, he said, in France, 105 Consistorial churches of the Protestant sect, which would give 21 synods ; and to these 21 synods it is proposed to confide the mission of establishing unity of faith in the Protestant Church. In the state of anarchy which now exists in the Reformed Church, these 21 synods would perhaps draw up 21 different confessions of faith ; and as, according to law, the resolutions of these synods have no force until they have been approved of by Government, in what a dilemma would not the Minister of Public Worship find himself. He would have to decide between these various confessions of faith, to pronounce which was orthodox and which was not. The Minister of Worship would thus be the Pope of the Protestants. At the close of this remarkable discussion, the Marquis de la Rochejaquelein described the petition as the cry of alarm of Protestantism ; he also concurred in the alarm which was justly felt at the spread of unbelief in France, and which was making way in all religions. The attack was first made on Catholicism ; and now it was conquering Protestantism. They who up till now doubted, believed no longer. What shall become of us, he asked, Catholics and fathers of families, when French society shall have become Materialist ? "One thing," he said, in concluding his speech, "is clear, and that is the destruction—the laying bare of Protestantism. Protestantism exists no more ; its professors teach openly the doctrines of Renan ; and they are left in their pulpits, where they profess the most destructive principles. A remedy is sought ; it is in unity of faith. But this remedy cannot be found where the evil exists to-day in Protestantism, which denies all things,—disputes all things. But without unity of faith men are brought to a state of confusion. . . . I am against those who deny all things, both in religion and in politics. The great evil of our epoch for Protestants, as for others, is negation ; but Protestants reap to-day that which they have sown."

As a corollary to this discussion in the Senate on the spread of unbelief in France, we call attention to a speech which has just been delivered, by M. Pelletan, as we are writing, in the Lower Chamber, on the moral and intellectual degradation of French society. After ascribing the demoralization of modern times to the system adopted by Government, to which we have already alluded, of putting down free speech and free writing, and of debarring the

people from the healthy and ennobling pursuits of public life, he describes the depths of degradation to which the stage has fallen in France. "It was no longer," he said, "intellectual dissoluteness; the stage at the present day pandered to ocular demoralization." The moral condition of France at the present day, he imputed, as a consequence of her intellectual famine. People said, "Let us amuse ourselves as we have nothing else to do." And they did "amuse themselves" with a vengeance; but pleasure had its evil consequences. It led to excess, to satiety, to vice, to crime. The speaker showed that according to the last Report of the Minister of Justice, offences against morality continued to increase in an alarming proportion. "From 1856 to 1860, they formed 53 per cent. of the whole number of offences against the person, whilst from 1826 to 1830, the proportion was only 23 per cent. Formerly, we are told, extreme demoralization used to be the result of a long career of crime, — of a long apprenticeship to vice, but vice had now become precocious, and acquired its full development before the human frame. "Young men of good family are trying to revive the morals of the Regency." "They squander away their lives and their patrimony." In a report lately published, an eminent magistrate stated that between the 31st July, 1862, and 1st of August, 1864, it had been found necessary to provide with legal guardians twenty-four young men of fortune, incapable of taking care of themselves. We can do no more than allude to the description which M. Pelletan gave, and which is but too well known, of the luxury and wantonness of Parisian society, of its extravagant and reckless expenditure, of its "toilettes sans reticences." He denounced, in no disguised terms, "the unimpassioned debauchery and languid depravity of the Parisian jeunesse d'orée, and a certain class of courtézans, which dazzles the town by its riches," and he held up the undeniable popularity of this "aristocracy of vice" as one of the characteristics of modern society. M. Pelletan concluded by asking the Chamber "what Europe could possibly think of them, when it found the *salons* of Paris, at one time the abode of taste and elegant refinement, borrowing songstresses from the wine-shop, and going into fits of enthusiasm over ditties of the gutter."

From such a description, which, we fear, is but too true, of the religious, intellectual, and moral state of society under the second empire, we turn with a sense of relief to a primitive land, a mountainous people, and to a purely Christian society.

The most satisfactory news of its kind from Germany is the address of the Tyrolese Diet to the Emperor of Austria. We do not know whether our readers remember the magnificent protest, published a few years ago by the bishops of Tyrol against the violation of the ancient religious rights of the country by the authorization given by the Viennese Cabinet to Protestants to purchase land in the Tyrol, to found communities, and to establish places of heretical worship. In the Tyrol there never has been any other religion but the Catholic; and no worship, to the confusion of Liberals, Catholic and Protestant, but that of the Church of God, is to this day tolerated by the laws and customs of this Catholic land.

On the advent of Schmerling to power, and under the new constitution of



the Austrian Empire, certain Protestant communities, desirous of intruding their false religion and teaching into the Tyrol, petitioned the Diet for authorization to found independent Protestant parishes or districts, on the establishment of which the right of holding public worship depends; on the rejection of the petition by the Diet, an appeal was made to Vienna, and Schmerling peremptorily overruled the decision of the Diet of Tyrol. Such a flagrant violation of the constitutional rights of the country and of the immemorial unity of religion excited universal indignation and discontent among the proverbially loyal Tyrolese. The rigorous protests of the Tyrolese Episcopate and the voice of the people were alike unheeded by the Austrian Government. On the fall, however, of the Schmerling administration, the Emperor, on the 17th of November, 1865, laid before the Tyrolese Diet, for its constitutional consideration, a Bill in harmony with the first and second decrees, touching the introduction of Protestant worship, of the Diet held on the 25th of February of the same year. In its address to the Emperor, the Diet recognizes in this magnanimous act an acknowledgment on the part of the Emperor that the unity of faith in the Tyrol is a matter which is subject to the laws of that country; and, while laying its deepest thanks on the steps of the Imperial throne, it expresses the hope that, in this important matter, such a law will be passed as is in harmony with the sacred custom of the country. The "faithful and obedient Diet," however, said that "it missed with deep sorrow in the Government Bill the Imperial assent to the fourth decree of the resolution of the Diet, touching the limitations of the rights of non-Catholics to possess property in the Tyrol." It pointed out that, in his letter of the 7th of September, 1859, the Emperor had recognized this proposition as of the highest moment, inasmuch as he had declared that it was a question which would have to be submitted to most mature and cautious consideration by the Diet.

"In fact," says the address, "if full liberty be given to non-Catholics to possess lands and to be naturalized in Tyrol, so is in future the great happiness of unity of faith in this country, in a certain measure, given up to chance. Such a surrender we cannot reconcile with our conscience; for, as we are appointed to act for the welfare of the land in the present time, so we are also responsible for the future. Such a surrender we cannot take upon ourselves to answer to our constituents. The people of the Tyrol have made known their will to preserve their national possession—unity of faith—by all the means which a loyal people can make use of. They consider such a wish as perfectly legitimate, and they will never be able to comprehend how or in what manner they have lost a right which their fathers enjoyed, and for which they had sacrificed possessions and life. The members of the Diet are well aware that their petition will be exposed to the most manifold misinterpretations and to the most unmitigated abuse. But," they say, "for this we are prepared, for we live in a time which, in its aim at completely separating Church and State, and at secularizing the laws of the State, tends towards atheism; and in such a time naturally the language of the Tyrolese people, inspired for the preservation of the unity of its faith, sounds strange and unintelligible."

The members of the Diet conclude their address by calling to mind the words lately used by the Emperor on the celebration of the five hundred years' union of Tyrol with Austria. With God's help, for hundreds and hundreds of years more will the Tyrolese stand firm and faithful by their Kaiser, and the Kaiser will keep faithful and firm to his Tyrolese.

The principles avowed in this address of the Tyrolese Diet and its manliness of tone are quite invigorating in these Liberalistic days of mock loyalty and half-hearted faith.

---

## Correspondence.

---

We are requested to publish the following correspondence between the Rev. W. Lockhart, of the Order of Charity, and the Writer of the Article on Freemasonry, which appeared in our January number.

### THE REV. W. LOCKHART TO THE WRITER.

DEAR SIR,—After reading the observations on Rosmini in your article on Freemasonry in the DUBLIN REVIEW, I wrote in the following terms to the Editor.

"I beg to call your attention to page 142 of the 'DUBLIN,' for January, 1866, in which the old, often-refuted calumny against our founder, Rosmini, is once more repeated. The passage is as follows:—'Freemasonry is condemned, first of all and chiefly, because its essential principle is indifferentism, and speculative indifferentism inevitably leads to Pantheism, in other words to a denial of the personalty of God, and is a rejection of the first motives of morality. In the same way it may be said that the practical side of Pantheism is a simple indifference to all forms of religion. This ancient error, as subtle and penetrating as the miasma which arises out of decaying matter, is drawing new force from the corruption and dissolution of Protestantism. In the seething state of society such as Europe now presents, there is no time for delay or hesitation in purifying the moral or intellectual atmosphere, in separating the sound from the unsound elements. Nothing is more remarkable than the way in which the Papal Allocutions of the last and present Pontificate revert, again and again, to the errors of Pantheism, or than the zeal and watchfulness with which unsound speculations are at once detected and condemned. The false theories of Lamennais, the errors of Gioberti's philosophy, Rosmini's untenable positions, were not allowed by Rome to pervert for an instant the minds of men unawares. In the like manner, the Holy See corrected the perhaps unconscious pantheistic tendencies of Baader, the graver errors of Günther, and the open Pantheism of Frohschammer. Rome everywhere stamps out this speculative plague; and because Freemasonry gives Pantheism a home and a practical office, Pius IX. has renewed the condemnation of the Church against the detestable Masonic sect.'—DUBLIN, p. 142.

"At page 173, the following passage occurs—'The secret societies . . . made use of the errors of men like Gioberti, or even of Rosmini, to dazzle and mislead the people. Whatever was rotten in society they scented out like ferrets, and batted on like carrion birds.'—DUBLIN, p. 173.

"I am quite sure that if I shall show you that a grave injustice has been done to the good name of our founder, and a grievous injury inflicted on his order by the DUBLIN REVIEW, you will make us the best reparation in your power. . . . Before taking notice of the injurious statements to which I have referred, I should be glad of a line from the author of the article, pointing out the Roman authority by which ANY POSITIONS OF ROSMINI have been condemned or pronounced untenable."

To the above letter, the Editor replies as follows :—

"I have forwarded your letter to the author of the article. He is not at all a person to make statements without good ground, though, of course, like another, he is liable to mistake. I propose that he should write you word, through me, what are the definite facts on which he has based his statement, and that you should write a reply. This reply I would pledge myself to insert in our next number; and at the same time to make the fullest retraction, and if so be, apology, which may seem due to the facts or arguments you may adduce. I hope you will consider this as fair a proposal as I can make under the circumstances, and I will send you his statement as soon as I receive it.

"With much respect, faithfully yours,

"W. G. WARD."

In due course, I was favoured by yourself with the following letter :—

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Having been informed by the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW that you were desirous of some explanation of a passing allusion to Rosmini, in my article on Freemasonry, I hasten to comply with your desire.

"In the passage which occurs in page 142 of the REVIEW, I was alluding to the well-known condemnation of the 'Cinque Piaghe.' I have since heard that this book, at a later period, was so explained by the author, as to release it from the prohibition under which it had lain for so many years. When I wrote I was not even aware that this had been alleged; and even now I do not know how far it is true. Need I say that it will give me the sincerest pleasure if you can demonstrate that such a satisfactory explanation has been made. In that case, I express, by anticipation, my extreme regret at having inflicted injury on Rosmini's memory, and given you on such a subject pain or any cause of complaint. In another passage of the same article I was referring to the ill-use which evil-disposed men had made of the political liberalism or false patriotism of Gioberti, and, though of course in a lesser degree of Rosmini, misprinted *Rossini*. Being aware that you know my name, I sign myself, yours truly,

"THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE ON FREEMASONRY."

I proceed now to reply, with as much brevity as possible, to the very serious charges which you make against the venerated founder of the society to which I have the honour to belong. I am glad that these charges have been repeated by you so publicly and unequivocally, as they give me an opportunity of replying to, and once more refuting, an old and often repeated calumny. It was answered in the life of Rosmini, published by me in 1856, and of which a second edition will shortly appear.

First, then—It is quite *true* that two small works of Rosmini were placed upon the Index in the year 1849; one being the "Cinque Piaghe," or "Five Wounds of the Church;" and the other "The Project of a Constitution for Italy." It is *not* true that these pamphlets have been taken off the Index; but it is *false* that *any proposition* in Rosmini's works has been condemned by Rome, or pronounced *untenable*. On the contrary, the whole of his other works, consisting of about 30 octavo volumes, after four years' examination by a special congregation in Rome, were pronounced to contain nothing worthy of censure in the usual form: "*Dimittantur opera Antonii Rosmini*," a sentence, which is the equivalent in the Congregation of the Index to the sentence *nil censuræ dignum* of the Sacred Congregation of Rites in the process of canonization. (See article in the *Armonia*, quoted in a note in the life of Rosmini, page 67.)

The circumstances which led to the solemn examination and acquittal of Rosmini's works were as follows :—During the pontificate of Gregory XVI., a school of theology, representing a numerous and powerful party, had taken a serious distrust of some of Rosmini's philosophical and theological principles, and laboured zealously to obtain a condemnation of his works chiefly by means of an anonymous publication entitled "Eusebio Cristiano." The Holy Father, after having read the confutation of that work by Rosmini himself, and having read the opinion of a congregation of cardinals to whom the matter had been referred, imposed silence on his accusers. In the Pontifical Brief, approving of Rosmini's new religious order, which had been issued by Gregory XVI. in the early years of his pontificate, he had already declared him to be "a man endowed with rare genius and surpassing mental gifts ; celebrated for his knowledge in things divine and human ; of singular piety, religion, virtue, probity, prudence, and integrity ; a man most Catholic, and deeply attached to the Holy See." And one of the acts of the last years of his pontificate was, as we have shown, to vindicate the high estimate of his character expressed in the Pontifical Brief. After the death of Gregory XVI., Rosmini enjoyed the confidence of his successor Pius IX., who, before his flight to Gaeta, had declared his intention of raising him to the cardinalate. He nominated him, in the meantime, Consultor of the two Sacred Congregations of the Holy Office and of the Index, and now permitted him to be his companion in exile. About one year, however, before Rosmini went to Rome on this occasion, he had published the two pamphlets mentioned above, both of them of a political tendency ; the one entitled "The Cinque Piaghe," and the other "Project of a Constitution for Italy." In these he spoke strongly in favour of the Church's liberty of action, especially in the election of bishops ; proposed a reform of the constitutions of the different Italian states, somewhat after the English model ; and advocated a confederation of the different sovereigns of Italy, with the Supreme Pontiff at their head. In the ferment of men's minds in Italy at that day, after the Roman revolution had broken out, and the Pope had been himself forced to fly from his capital, it was no wonder if the Sacred Congregation of the Index should, in its high wisdom, see reasons for withdrawing these works from circulation. Rosmini being informed of the sentence, at once submitted himself in the following words, "With the feelings of the most devoted and obedient son of the Holy See, as by the grace of God I have always been in heart, and have always publicly professed myself to be, I declare that I submit myself to the prohibition of the aforesaid works, purely, simply, and heartily praying you to assure the most Holy Father and the Sacred Congregation of this my submission." No proposition having been singled out for censure by the Sacred Congregation in the aforesaid books, Rosmini could do no more than submit, as he did, without reserve. But now the party opposed to Rosmini, imagining that the silence imposed upon them by Gregory XVI. was no longer binding, and, emboldened by the prohibition of the two pamphlets, commenced once more in the following year their endeavours to obtain the condemnation of all his other works, amounting to about thirty volumes in octavo, and treating of idealogy, logic, metaphysics, and many other subjects. The mode which they took to accomplish this was by presenting to many of the bishops, chiefly in Italy, and to other theologians, in the greatest confidence, an anonymous work entitled "Postille di un anonimo," in which three hundred and twenty-seven propositions, extracted, as it was said, from Rosmini's works, were arranged under various heads, and impugned of heresy and errors of every kind ; and Rosmini was accused of teaching Arianism, Pelagianism, Jansenism, Fatalism, Quietism, Pantheism, sedition, and many more pernicious errors. Soon after, the same party threw off all reserve

loudly, proclaiming that Rosmini's works were as unsound as they had always declared, and that the Holy See had already justified their accusations by placing two of his books on the Index. They now published the three hundred and twenty-seven propositions, or "Postille," mentioned above, and which had hitherto been only circulated privately; as well as several other works on the same controversy. It was upon this that Rosmini and the Fathers of his society made a humble supplication to the Supreme Pontiff for a formal examination of all his works. The Pope acceded to their request; and on his return to Rome appointed a special Congregation of the most learned theologians and cardinals to examine all the works of Rosmini, with a view to the special accusations of the Postille. The examination lasted four years; at the end of which time, on the 3rd of July, 1854, the Congregation, presided over by the Pope himself, rejected as untenable every one of the 327 charges, declaring the works themselves to be dismissed, free of censure, in the usual form, "Dimittantur opera Antonii Rosmini," which sentence was officially communicated to Rosmini's Procurator, then in Rome. The two pamphlets were not included in this examination, because they were not included in the censures of the "Postille," neither was any effort made on the part of Rosmini to have them examined or removed from the Index, because it was considered more respectful to the Holy See to await its pleasure in the matter, since all that was absolutely necessary for the vindication of Rosmini's good name and that of his society had already been effected in the recent decision in his favour by the highest authority in the Church. I think I have now clearly stated my case, and have shown that the voluminous works of Rosmini, with the exception of two small pamphlets of a political character, have been pronounced to contain nothing worthy of censure. You allege, however, as the grounds of your accusation, the simple fact of the two works having been placed on the Index. But surely, if in your estimate of Rosmini you lay so much stress on the prohibition by the Index of these two pamphlets, at least you should give him the full benefit of the fact that all his other works have been pronounced by the same authority free from all the charges that have been brought against them. Then with regard to the two works themselves, you will, I am sure, admit, that you have gone far beyond your evidence in implying that any propositions in them have been censured, or pronounced "untenable," whereas they were both placed on the Index, without the least indication being given of the motives of the Sacred Congregation. Upon these motives it would seem unbecoming in any private individual to pronounce an opinion, either by way of intimating charges of unsoundness against the author, or, on our own side, by confidently asserting the contrary. So much, however, is certain, that books are placed on the Index, for *extrinsic* as well as for *intrinsic* reasons (see Ferrari on prohibited books, and Scavini's Theologia Moralis, Vol. v. p. 758, tenth edition), and surely it is a fair and charitable inference in the case of a Catholic author, whose other works have been so accurately scrutinized, and so fully acquitted, as those of Rosmini's have been; that the two smaller works may have been prohibited, rather for *extrinsic* reasons of prudence, arising out of times and circumstances, than because they contain any untenable or censurable propositions; and since the Holy See has not pronounced, you will admit, I think, that we have a right to complain at the way in which Rosmini's name has been branded by private authority. Such, then, is the simple statement of the facts of the case which have often been made public before, but which have not become so well known as the fact that Rosmini's works had been at one time under suspicion, and that two of his works had actually been placed on the Index. I cannot, as I think, better conclude this notice than by quoting



the words of one of the most learned of our English ecclesiastics, unconnected with Rosmini or his order. He wrote, on his return from Rome, when all the facts were fresh in his memory, which he had learned from leading persons on both sides, who were engaged in the controversy, then recently concluded in the dismissal of the charges against Rosmini. This letter I have had by me for years, and I have the writer's permission to publish it.

On the subject of Rosmini, he thus writes :—"How many of the saints have been under suspicion and even censure ! St. Theresa was denounced to the Inquisition ; St. Bernardine, of Sienna, was summoned to Rome as guilty of superstition ; St. Ignatius was put in the prison of the Inquisition ; St. Alphonsus was accused and held guilty, and put out of his superiors ; St. Joseph Calasanti was not only accused but condemned, and his order suppressed, and the saint died under these humiliations. Many others, whose names are amongst those who are venerated by the Church, have had books put upon the Index. It is not therefore for us to judge what may be in the grace and prevision of God reserved for Father Rosmini, whose humility, patience, and obedience under the greatest mortifications and humiliations have won the admiration of his adversaries. But I believe I need not tell you that Father Rosmini's works, after four or five years of the most rigorous scrutiny at Rome, were dismissed with the fullest acquittal ever given to the works of any writer, except those of a canonized saint, and I may add, with the strongest declarations on the part of the Holy Father."

I now claim your promise, and that of the Editor, of such a retraction "as may seem due to the facts or arguments adduced" in justification of Rosmini. You have stated that some of Rosmini's principles have been censured by Rome. I have shown you that no proposition of Rosmini has been censured or declared untenable ; you have implied, as the only obvious meaning of your words, that Rosmini was a man of unsound doctrine, implicated in anti-social, anti-christian, pantheistic errors ; and a good deal more is insinuated than is actually stated to his dishonour, which may be summed up in that short but telling sentence in which you consign him to the category of "whatever was rotten in society," which the Italian liberals "scented out like ferrets and batten on like carrion birds." I have shown you on the contrary, quoting the words of a competent and impartial witness, that Rosmini has been freed from all censure "with the fullest acquittal ever given to any writer except a canonized saint." I am quite sure you have written all these things in good faith, having simply repeated a current report which you thought well founded, and of which you had never heard the refutation. It seems as if there were a perverse instinct in our nature, which leads us easily to catch up and remember injurious reports, and not readily to hear or more easily to forget the answers to them. I need not remind you that these kind of statements which flow glibly from the tongue or pen, and are often brought in as you say *incidentally*, and by way of rounding off a paragraph or expressing a theological bias or antipathy, do grave wrong to a Catholic writer or a religious order, which may be the subject of them. It is under these kind of calumnies which are most difficult fully and finally to set at rest when once they have been put in motion, that the society to which I belong has suffered for years.

I now leave the matter in your hands, and in those of the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW.

I remain, dear Sir, yours truly,

WILLIAM LOCKHART,

*Priest of the Order of Charity.*

## REPLY OF THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—In the first of the two passages in my article on Freemasonry which refer to Rosmini, his name is coupled with those of writers whose philosophical or religious opinions have been censured or condemned by Rome; in the second, which speaks of the false principles of nationalism so prevalent in Italy, allusion is made to two well-known works, by the same author, now on the Index. Evidently the more obvious, although not the necessary, construction of the first passage is to refer the untenable positions, spoken of as taken up by Rosmini, not to errors of a political character, but to such philosophical opinions as were condemned in the authors mentioned in the same paragraph.

Being so, it is only just and fair to state now, most emphatically, that, since Rosmini's theological and philosophical system has been submitted to the scrutiny of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, and declared free from all dogmatical error, his name ought not in any, even passing, allusion, to be coupled with those of men whose theological or philosophical opinions have been condemned as erroneous. That any imputation should even appear, by such an association of names, to rest on Rosmini's *theological and philosophical* opinions is a matter I sincerely regret; but, as you may perceive, on reference to my letter, I expressly limited the terms you protest against in my article, to such political works of Rosmini's as are still on the Index. The greater part of your letter is beside the question at issue between us, since it is taken up with a defence of those works to which no blame is imputed, since they are not on the Index; that portion only in your letter am I concerned with, therefore, which endeavours to make it appear that the two ecclesiastico-political works of Rosmini's which, soon after their publication, were placed by the Holy See on the Index, incurred no censure. First of all, however, it is necessary to show that, in the second passage you object to in my article, from its context, if not from express statement, there can be no mistake or doubt as to the character of the errors imputed to Rosmini. Since you have not quoted the sentence at full, I will supply here the words which explain the meaning of the allusion:—"The secret societies, especially in Italy, propagated these (revolutionary) doctrines with unabating energy; they ensnared the young by appeals to a false patriotism, &c. They made use of the errors of men, like Gioberti, or even of Rosmini, to dazzle and mislead the people." Certain of the errors, then, made use of by the revolutionary party to ensnare the young and mislead the people of Italy in their appeals to a false patriotism were the principles advocated by Rosmini in those two of his works, which, together with their appendixes, were placed on the Index. Writing, therefore, in the DUBLIN REVIEW in praise of the watchfulness of Rome in detecting all opinions calculated gravely to mislead the people, I was justified in instancing the prohibition of the errors even of such a man as Rosmini, and I am still more bound to assert that, since the "Cinque Piaghe" and its appendix, "sull elezione di vescovi a clero e popolo," and "La costituzione;" together with its appendix "sull unità d'Italia," have been placed on the Index, every good Catholic is bound to regard such works as in themselves unsound or worthy of censure.

While, however, admitting the fact that these works are still on the Index, you yet deny that they have been censured, and you ground this denial on the absence of any indication, on the part of the Sacred Congregation, as to its motives in prohibiting these books of Rosmini's; and, finally, you infer that since there are *extrinsic* as well as *intrinsic* reasons for placing books on the Index, "that the two smaller works may have been prohibited, rather

for extrinsic reasons of prudence arising out of times and circumstances, than because they contain any untenable or censurable propositions." But is there any warranty whatsoever for such an inference? It is extremely rare, and only in very exceptional cases, according to the testimony of one of the highest living authorities on the subject, that books are placed on the Index without a previous examination, or without a condemnation on their merits. These exceptional cases are expressly explained and provided for, and Rosmini's case by no means comes under that exceptional category. In his letter to M. Rouland, the then Minister of State, Mgr. Nardi, Auditor of the Rota and Consultor of the Index, explains the course of proceeding, and the rules of the Sacred Congregation. It will be much to the purpose to give a few extracts from his letter. "In the first place," he says, "if the author be a man known to fame as a Catholic, and the error be not palpable, he is appealed to, and is requested either to explain the objectionable passages in his work, or to correct them in subsequent editions of his book, as has been done in numerous instances, and as was done quite recently in the case of an eminent Italian historian.\* If the error is serious, and one which necessarily entails condemnation, we always question him at the least in order that he may submit to judgment, and that we may be able, while we publish the censure upon his books, to praise him for having submitted." Rosmini comes under this category, for the fact is beyond question, as I will show, that he was appealed to and laudably submitted to his sentence. "If there are points which are obscure or doubtful, the law," continues Mgr. Nardi, "gives the author the benefit of the doubt. If his impiety and perversity are evident; if truth is manifestly falsified to a serious and dangerous extent, what need have we of further proof, of further evidence, or of depositions? The Congregation are in a manner judges of fact, not of guilt, if guilt there is; for error, although it puts a danger in the path of Christians, may sometimes, and up to a certain point, be excused in the person of the author."

The writer then cites instances to show that the intentions of an author may be innocent, though his works be censurable.

... "Piety, zeal, charity itself may be carried to excess," he continues, "may inspire indiscreet words, and may degenerate into pernicious principles. When the Church sees a danger, she regards neither the worth nor the desert of the person, his excellence of character, or erudition. She fulfils her mission as the guardian of pure doctrine. By the help of God, she preserves the world from error; and when she places an interest in this or that book, her aim is not to wound or stigmatize an author, but to warn the faithful of the snares which are laid for their faith or their morals. It is her duty to do this: she has done it from the beginning, and she will do it to the end."

As you expressly state that Rosmini's books "were both placed on the Index without the least indication being given of the motives of the Sacred Congregation," and since you not unjustly consider it unbecoming in any private individual to pronounce an opinion as to these motives, you cannot complain if, in reply to your objections, I once more appeal to an authority so high and public as Mgr. Nardi. His explanation, which precisely touches your objection as to the non-indication of motives in the condemnation of Rosmini's books, is as follows:—"But why, it may be asked, do we not at least publish the reasons for our decisions? I reply that we do publish them in very grave cases, as appears in the Pontifical briefs, which condemn the writings of Hermes, of Günther, and of Frohschammer, writings which were very pernicious, and which might have generated scholastic errors and heterodox sects. . . . Besides, it is only inferior tribunals that publish

\* Cesare Cantu.

the reasons of their judgments, in order that the party condemned by them may appeal, if he pleases, from them to a higher court. Now, the sentence of the Index is that of the Sovereign Pontiff, from which there is no appeal. It would be, therefore, useless to publish the reasons. . . . Yet the 'reasons,' although they are not published, are made the subject of study and discussion, and nothing is neglected which may insure the justice of the sentence." Such an answer from such a quarter is more than sufficient, I should think, to meet your objection as to the non-assignment of motives, on the part of the Sacred Congregation, in their condemnation of Rosmini's two works.

It would be superfluous to do more than merely allude to Mgr. Nardi's remarks as to the care and impartiality of the sacred tribunal. The consultors, he says, are men who are thoroughly versed in the matter in question. They have to read the incriminated book from beginning to end, and to study it according to the rules laid down by the Council of Trent, and by the immortal Benedict XIV. One of the rules on which he comments, and which is not without application to the matter in question, in this correspondence, runs thus:—"Ambiguities should always be construed favourably in the case of an author who bears a good name." In reference to some great men whom he mentions in connection with this rule, the writer says, "The Pope, however, abstained from condemning the works of these great men when brought before his notice, because he considered that the reputation and the merit of these writers deserved some indulgence in cases where indulgence can be granted without certain peril to the Church, who weighs advantages and disadvantages before speaking out. Sometimes the consultors propose to leave the book uncondemned, which is often done; at others they suggest to the author certain alterations to be made in a fresh edition. . . . Lastly, in a case of decided perversity, they decree that the work deserves to be condemned. . . . But the decision, even though unanimous, is by no means definitive. It has to be revised by the Superior Congregation, which is composed of Cardinals alone . . . and yet this second and more solemn judgment is not a definite sentence, but only an inquiry of a superior class. The whole is referred to the Sovereign Pontiff, who passes the final sentence, and until he has spoken nothing is condemned."

It follows from this that "private individuals," when they know that a certain book has been placed on the Index, or, in other words, has been condemned by the Pope, have a perfect right, without laying themselves open to the imputation of unwarrantable motives, to speak of the writer of such a condemned book as having advanced "untenable positions;" provided, only, that the Sacred Congregation has not thought fit to depart from its usual course of proceeding. The usual course, however, is to condemn books on their merits; that is, for intrinsic reasons. Mgr. Nardi, so familiar with the practice of Rome, has also explained, in a private communication on the subject, which I have shown to you, under what exceptional circumstances only, books, on purely extrinsic reasons, are placed on the Index. The cases, he says, are few. Such as if an author be known as constantly and notoriously hostile to religion, or if a writer, who, although calling himself a Catholic, were to teach constantly and in a dangerous manner heretical doctrines. In such cases, he observes, it might be that the Church could pronounce not as condemning writings, still unknown, but as prohibiting them from being read. Still less does the Index condemn books on political motives, to satisfy the approbation or the malice of a strong party. The Index says Mgr. Nardi is very indifferent to political matters while they remain only political; and no party has power to influence its decisions, which are completely free and

independent. Any moral pressure would be impossible, and if possible, useless. Very seldom could the inexpediency of its publication be a motive for the condemnation of a book by the Index. If circumstances of places or persons would perhaps make a book so dangerous as to produce scandal or dissensions or troubles or other disorders among the clergy, then a prohibition for that reason may be possible.

"For instance," continues Mgr. Nardi, in explanation of these rare and exceptional cases, "if the Holy See *command silence to both parties* on a very irritating question, and *one party* were to break the silence with a very violent book, this work, for such an extrinsic reason, *might perhaps* be prohibited." Since, then, none of these exceptional cases are of a kind to apply to Rosmini's speculative politics and ecclesiastical theories, it is no longer a matter of inference that the works of his which were placed on the Index were prohibited, not for extrinsic reasons, but for their intrinsic errors.

It by no means, however, necessarily follows from the fact of a book being placed on the Index, that such a book is condemned for heresy, it may be condemned for lesser errors. It is, indeed, no very uncommon an occurrence that writers, the general tendency of whose works, especially on matters more intimately connected with religion, are in every way of the most edifying character, yet on political questions, in which the interests of religion are deeply involved, fall into serious errors, against which, on account of the very excellence of the writers in other respects, it is the more imperative to protest. And so in the case of Rosmini; however excellent his other works may be, it is not to be denied that such of his writings as were placed on the Index, like those of Gioberti, by flattering the spirit of false nationalism—everywhere dangerous, as setting up a standard of its own, but in Italy pregnant with incalculable mischief—could not fail to engender revolutionary ideas on matters of Church and State. Such writings served, in the hands of malicious men, to provoke an agitation in men's minds as alien to the spirit of Christianity, and to Catholic unity, as it was adverse to the legitimate authority of the civil power. With what force and frequency have not the Encyclical letters, of late, reprobated this growing evil of modern society? Can we, therefore, be surprised at finding such Catholics, even though of great name, as have tampered or temporized with this evil spirit, falling under the censure of Rome?

By the help of Mgr. Nardi's evidence on the rules and customs of the Index I have shown that Rosmini was one of those Catholics of high repute, some of whose works fell under such a grave censure. Nay more, since you not unnaturally required a still more authoritative witness than Mgr. Nardi, and referred me in our conversation on this matter, as to an unquestionable source, to the Bull of Benedict XIV., prefixed as its explanatory code to the Index, it now appears, on reference, that no such exceptional cases, as you seem to rely on, as exempting Rosmini's two works from censure, are to be found in that highest authority on the rules and practice of the Index.

On the strength of such unimpeachable authorities as I have cited, you must now, I think, admit, not only that it is true in fact, that two of Rosmini's books, together with their appendixes, were placed on the Index; but that they thereby incurred the prohibition and censure of the Holy See. Hence, it necessarily follows, that the assertions and implications in your letter, that Rosmini's two works had not been censured by Rome, or pronounced untenable, are unfounded: which is what I had to prove. I was the more bound to do so, in self-defence, since the contradictory of your proposition is not only the justification of the allusion in the DUBLIN REVIEW to the political errors of Rosmini, but a complete vindication from the charge of calumny.

You must permit me, too, in conclusion, to say that I cannot, without a

protest, allow you to take so lightly for granted that Catholic writers, glibly or otherwise, merely in order to round off a period, or to express a theological bias, would make themselves guilty of a grave calumny against an individual or an order. Moreover, I trust, that by the testimony of the authorities which I have referred to, I have now satisfied you that, not from the *perverse malignity* of human nature, but from motives of loyalty to the Holy See and out of a jealous regard of the authority of the Sacred Congregation, Catholics may have declared, as they may declare again, whenever the occasion demands it, that in political questions, gravely affecting spiritual interests, Rosmini had unfortunately advanced positions so untenable as to draw upon them prohibition and censure from the ecclesiastical authorities of Rome. All Catholics, however, will gladly avow that your venerated founder was too true a son of the Church to attempt to break the force, or explain away the motives, of such a condemnation; and they will see an additional claim on their veneration in the following words, appended to the sentence of the Index—*auctor laudabiliter se subjecit*. It is, perhaps, neither needless nor unbecoming in the writer of this letter, since he has been compelled to comment on some errors into which Rosmini was betrayed, to express the deep gratitude which he, in common with every Catholic, owes to the venerated founder of your order, not only for his learned labours on behalf of religion, but still more for his devoted loyalty to the person of the Pope during his exile at Gaeta, and for the practical piety so well expressed in the foundation of the Institute of Charity.—I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir, yours truly,

THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE ON FREEMASONRY.

---



## INDEX.

---

ACTA CONCILII FLORENTINI, *reviewed*, 496.

Alemaný (Archbishop), of San Francisco, 31.

ALEXANDRIA, THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS OF: ORIGEN, 377-412; Mystery of the Authorship of the Septuagint, 377; state of that version in Origen's time, 378; competing versions, 379; Origen designs the Hexapla, 380; its method, 381; the assistance he received from Ambrose, 382; the Tetrapla, 383; summary of Origen's work on the Bible, 383; Origen's various labours at Alexandria, 384; his philosophical works, 385; analysis of his *De Principiis*, 386, 387; Saint Gregory's panegyric on his character, 388, 389; the character of the Alexandrian scholar in general, and Origen's method of training, 389-396; character of Origen's piety, 397; S. Gregory's description of the sorrow of the scholar in leaving his master, 398, 399; Origen's absence from Alexandria, 399, 400; his ordination at Cæsarea, and retirement thither from Alexandria, 400, 401; description of Cæsarea, 401, 402; Origen's relations with S. Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, and S. Theoctistus, Bishop of Cæsarea, 402, 403; Origen's Homilies and Commentaries mark a new era in the exposition of Scripture, 404; character of his Commentaries, 405; the Ebionite and Gnostic schools, 406-409; Origen's leading idea on Scripture exposition, 409; his three Canons, 410; comparison of Origen and S. John of the Cross, 411; conclusion, 411, 412.

Allies (T. W., M.A.), Church of England cleared from the charge of schism, 216.

Allies (T. W.) *Letter to Dr. Pusey*, 239-259.

Arnoldi (P. J., S. J.), *De Imitatione Sacri Cordis Jesu*, *noticed*, 296.

Austria, 586-588: Address of the Tyrolese Diet to the Emperor on the subject of establishing Protestant worship in their country, 586-588.

BADELEY (EDWARD, M.A.), the Privilege of Religious Confessions, *noticed*, 273.

Barrow (John Croker), the Valley of Tears, *noticed*, 288.

Barruel (Abbé), *Memoirs illustrating the history of Jacobinism*, *reviewed*, 137.

Belgium, 576-579: the death of King Leopold, 576; probabilities of annexation to France, 576; great danger from its internal dissensions, 576; the Catholic and the Liberal parties, 576, 577; danger from the democratic character of the Constitution, 577; the Students' Congress at Liège, 577-579.

Bossuet's controversy with Orsi, 522, 524, 532, 534.

Butt (Isaac), the Liberty of Teaching vindicated, *noticed*, 271.

VOL. VI. [*New Series.*]

2 R

**CALIFORNIA AND THE CHURCH, 1-35:** Arrival of F. Junipero Serra in California Alta in the year 1769, 1; character of the Spanish Government in America, 2; F. Junipero's character and design, 3; method of the early missions, 4; combined action of the Church and Government, 4, 5; statistics and summary of the system, 5-7; immigration of the Americans, 7; discovery of gold, 8; the diggers, 9; present condition of Government, 10; commercial character and natural resources of California, 11-14; contrast of the Spanish and the Anglo-Saxon policy towards the Indians, 14-17; Spanish and Yankee topography, 17; spirit of the two races, 18; progress of the Church in California, 19; probabilities of persecution in America, 20; work and prospects of the Church in California, 20-22; peculiar character of the Californians, 22, 23; the proper missionary spirit, 23, 24; Catholic traditions and antiquities of California, 24, 25; Irish pioneers of California, 25, 26; rapid growth of the Catholic element, 26, 27; their churches, schools, and hospitals, 27, 28; character of the Californian Irish Catholics, 28, 29; the Archbishop of San Francisco, 30, 31; immoral character of the state educational system, 32, 33; action of the Jesuits in California, 33, 34; their sodalities, 34, 35; general summary, 35.

Campbell (John, D.D.), Popery Ancient and Modern, *reviewed*, 78.

Carlyle (Thomas), on Cromwell's Irish policy, notes to, 115, 121, 124, 131, 134.

Castlehaven (Earl of), his character, 115.

**CATHOLIC INSTINCTS, 78-107:** Analogy between the lower classes of creatures in the physical and the moral orders, 78-80; general character of Dr. Campbell's book on Popery, 80, 81; his topics and manner of treating them, 81, 82; character of his "instincts," 83; Catholic instincts, 83, 84; effect of the Church on Dr. Campbell's nature, 84, 85; reason and instinct, 85, 86; Dr. Campbell's intellectual character, 86, 87; the "spirit of the times," 87-89; the spirit of the Church, 89-91; antagonism between the spirit of the times and that of the Church, 91, 92; duty of Catholics in these days, 92, 93; peculiar character of the spirit of the present age, 93-95; consequences with regard to the action of Catholics, 95, 96; development of Catholic instincts, 96-98; the Catholic habit of mind, 98-100; the instinct of the saints, 100; the proper standard for Catholics in the world, 101-105; general conclusions, 106, 107.

Catholic Statistics of the United States, 20.

**CATHOLICISM RESTORED IN GENEVA, 325-348:** State of Geneva when annexed to France, 325; appointment of a Curé of Geneva the necessary consequence of the Concordat, 326; character of and undertaking of M. Vuarin, 326, 327; the Catholic population of Geneva, 327, 328; restoration of the Republic, 328; M. Vuarin appeals to the Allies for protection, 329; decision of the Congress, 330; M. Vuarin's contest with the Republican authorities, 331; final guarantee of the liberties of the Church in Geneva, 332; consequent state of opinion in Geneva, 333; annexation of the district to the diocese of Fribourg, 334; character of Mgr. Yenni, Bishop of Fribourg, 334; his relations with M. Vuarin, 335, 336;

- Mgr. Yenni and the Government, 336-338 ; Memorial of the Clergy, consequent controversy and reconciliation, 338, 339 ; the Revolution of 1830, 340 ; the "Evangelical Revival" at Geneva, 340, 341 ; M. Vuarin's attack on the Venerable Company, 341 ; general state of Protestantism at Geneva, 342, 343 ; M. Vuarin's pamphlets, 344, 345 ; his death, 345 ; the democratic revolution of 1846, 346, 347 ; M. Vuarin's successor, 348.
- CHAMPAGNY'S ROMAN EMPIRE, 449-485 : Ignorance in England of Count de Champagny's works, 449 ; effect of Christianity on Roman affairs, and its place in Roman history, 450 ; example from the gradual introduction of standing armies, 451 ; the *Saturday Review's* criticism on the Count de Champagny, 452 ; remarks upon it, 453 ; leading idea of the Cæsars, 453, 454 ; of Rome and Judæa, 454, 455 ; the position of the Jews in the Empire, 455-458 ; description of Jerusalem, 458, 459 ; the causes of the destruction of the Jewish city and polity, 459-463 ; M. de Champagny's description of these events, 463, 464 ; his contrast of Roman and modern freedom, 464, 466 ; his view of the Roman empire as a federation, 466, 467 ; action of the Church on slavery, 467, 468 ; the Agape, 468, 469 ; effect of slavery on poor freemen, 470, 471 ; Christian labour, 471 ; effect of Christianity on private life, 472 ; reviving interest in Roman history, 473 ; modern Paganism, 474 ; modern analogies to the ancient ideas of government, 475-479 ; substitution of the idea of Civilization for Christianity, 479 ; examples from the *Saturday Review*, 480-483 ; increasing advantage of studying the history of the Romans under the empire, 483-485.
- Champagny (Comte F. de), les Cæsars, *reviewed*, 449.
- Rome et la Judée, *reviewed*, 449.
- Les Antonins, *reviewed*, 449.
- CHRISTIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY, 348-377 : All sound Political Economy rests on the maxims of the Gospel, or of the Catholic Church, 348 ; the mainspring of wealth, thrift, comes from self-denial, 349 ; Christian character of recent Continental Political Economy, 350 ; general character of Professor Perin's Political Economy, 350-352 ; the passion for riches one of the great dangers of the present age, 352 ; modern society oscillating between heathenism and Christianity, 354, 355 ; tendency of wealth in Christian and in heathen societies, 356 ; the law and practice of self-renunciation, 357, 358 ; Christianity the true solution of all the problems of Political Economy, 359 ; relations of liberty and property, 360-362 ; of wealth, labour, and self-denial, 362-364 ; Mediæval Monasticism, 365 ; the condition of England, 365-367 ; the question of Strikes as settled in France, 368, 369 ; the question of population, 370-374 ; advantages of the study of Political Economy from a Christian point of view, 374, 375 ; speech of M. Cochin in this view at Malines, 375-377.
- Clara (Santa), college of, 31.
- Cochin (M.), Speech at Malines, 375-377.
- Commons, the Shilling House of, *reviewed*, 177.
- Constantinople, the Patriarchate of, its authority, 523.
- CROMWELL'S CONQUEST AND SETTLEMENT OF IRELAND, 107-137 : Cromwell's appointment as Lord-Lieutenant and departure from London, 107, 108 ;

composition of his army, 108 ; general view of the forces opposed to the Parliament in Ireland, 109 ; Cromwell's arrival in Dublin, 110 ; character and composition of the armies of Ormond, O'Neill, and Munro, 111 ; O'Neill's negotiation with the Parliament, 112 ; Ormond's exertions during the previous year, 113 ; estimate of his character and intellect, 114 ; his defective military ability, 115 ; his chief military adviser, Lord Castlehaven, 115, 116 ; the commissariat of Ormond's army, 116, 117 ; his march into Leinster, 117 ; character of Lord Inchiquin, 117, 118 ; Inchiquin's expedition to North Leinster, 118 ; the battle of Rathmines, 119 ; Ormond's second army, 120 ; general estimate of the numbers opposed to Cromwell, 120 ; Cromwell's policy, 121 ; his speech about the Canaanites, 122 ; the ferocity of religious generals, 122, 123 ; the peculiar ferocity of Cromwell, 123 ; the Puritan view of war with the Irish, 124 ; tendency of the English nation to blacken the character of subject races, 125 ; the Indian mutiny, the Jamaica outbreak, the rising of 1641, 126 ; real character of the rising of 1641, 127, 128 ; commencement of Cromwell's campaign, 128 ; Ormond's plans, 129 ; appointment of Sir Arthur Aston to command at Drogheda, 130 ; his march and entry, 131 ; Cromwell's siege and storm, 132-135 ; particulars of the massacre, 135, 136 ; Mr. Prendergast's book, 137.

DOD'S PARLIAMENTARY COMPANION, *reviewed*, 177.

Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church, *noticed*, 547.

Drogheda, Cromwell's siege of, 132.

Dyer (Thomas H.), *History of the city of Rome*, *noticed*, 292.

ECKERT (E. E.), *Der Friemaurer-Orden*, *reviewed*, 137.

FABER (F. W., D.D.), *Notes on Doctrinal Subjects*, *noticed*, 556.

Fenian Conspiracy, 486.

Fessler (Bishop), *Venerabilis Bartholomæi a Martyribus Compendium*, *noticed*, 295.

Fitzgerald v. Northcote and another, report in full, *noticed*, 557.

Fleury et Martin (Abbés), *Histoire de M. Vuarin*, *reviewed*, 325.

FLORENCE, THE COUNCIL OF, 496-541 : Challenge of the Unionist party on the case of the Council of Florence, 496 ; illustrations, 496, 497 ; the real circumstances that led to the Council, 497, 498 ; comparison of the case of the Unionists with that of the Greeks, 498-500 ; illustration from Popoff's work, 501, 502 ; homage of the Greek bishops to the Pope, 502, 503 ; language held by the Western champions concerning Papal prerogatives, 454 ; declarations of the Bishop of Forlì, Archbishop of Rhodes, and Cardinal Julian, 504, 506 ; citation from the Latin Acts, 507 ; the Dominican Provincial John on the Primacy, 507, 508 ; text of the decree, 509 ; the *Union Review's* propositions concerning the decree examined, 509-514 ; narrative of proceedings at the Council after the Dominican Provincial's oration, 514-522 ; Bossuet's arguments in the controversy with Orsi, 522, 523 ; the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, 523 ; Bossuet's argument confuted, 524 ; the Pope's conduct, 525 ; the

Emperor and the Bishops, 526 ; objection from the honourable position assigned to the Easterns at Florence considered, 527-530 ; objection that the Pope addressed the Greek Bishops as brethren, 530 ; and that he spoke of "uniting the Church of God," 530-532 ; certain discrepancies between the Greek and Latin Acts on questions of detail, 532 ; on a passage in the Greek Acts used by Bossuet, 532-534 ; Orsi's answer, 534 ; advantage, nevertheless, of such an argument to the Anglican Unionist, 534 ; real answer to it, 535-537 ; decision of the Council concerning Purgatory 537, 538 ; question of divorce, 538, 539 ; proof that no concession was made to the Easterns on the question of Purgatory, 539, 540 ; general conclusions as to the attitude of the Easterns and Westerns, 540, 541.

**FOUNDRESS (THE) OF THE FAITHFUL COMPANIONS OF JESUS, 59-78 ;** various character and work of the religious orders, 59, 60 ; peculiar difficulties of the foundation of the Faithful Companions, 60 ; early training of their foundress, 60, 61 ; sufferings of her family during the Revolution, 61, 62 ; her marriage, 62, 63 ; her widowhood and vocation, 63, 64 ; inspiration of founding the congregation of Faithful Companions, 65 ; trials and crosses at its commencement, 66, 67 ; first establishment at Amiens, 67, 68 ; the two following years, 68, 69 ; ecclesiastical difficulties, 70 ; Madame d'Houet's illness, 71 ; devolves her work upon Julie Guillemet, 71 ; her recovery, 72 ; anecdotes of the House, 72, 73 ; Madame d'Houet's visit to Rome, 73 ; interview with Leo XII., 74 ; first foundation in England, 75-76 ; extension to Switzerland and Piedmont, 77 ; second journey to Rome, 77 ; formal approbation of the Institute, 78 ; death of the Foundress, 78.

**France, 579-586 :** Movements in the Quartier Latin, 579, 580 ; the silence of Prince Napoleon, 580 ; French diplomacy concerning the Convention of September, 580, 581 ; the Spanish Red Book on the Roman Question 582 ; Cardinal Antonelli's circular, 582 ; the Tiers Parti in the French Chambers, 583 ; the recent discussion in the Lower Chamber and Senate on Protestantism in France, 583-585 ; M. Pelletan on the moral degradation of French Society, 585, 586.

**FREEMASONRY, THE PAPAL ALLOCUTION ON, 137-176 :** Character of the Allocution, 137, 138 ; alleged antiquity of masonry, 139 ; its real origin, 140, 141 ; Freemasonry incompatible with Christianity, 141 ; its Pantheistic character, 142 ; action of the masonic societies, 143 ; essential object of masonry, 144-146 ; the masonic phraseology, 146, 147 ; masonry in Germany, 148 ; character of Nicholai, 149 ; Heinemann's "Appeal," 150 ; Frederick the Second's relations with masonry, 150, 151 ; edict of his successor, Frederick William, 151 ; Baron Knigge's system of religion, 152 ; origin of illuminism, 152, 153 ; its operations in Bavaria and Franconia, 153, 154 ; the masonic congress of 1781, 155 ; the Syncritic German masonry, 156 ; suppression of the sect in Bavaria, 157 ; masonry in Russia, 157-159 ; masonry in France, 159, 160 ; its relation to the immorality and impiety of the Revolution, 161-163 ; its suppression in Austria, 163 ; its policy towards Napoleon, 164 ; resumption of its operations in Russia, 164, 165 ; masonry in Belgium, Spain, and Portugal, 165 ; the Carbonari in Italy and France, 166, 167 ; the Papal censures

of Pius VII. and Leo XII. and the Encyclical *Qui Pluribus*, 168 ; the masonic congress of Strasbourg, 168, 169 ; the revolutions of 1848, 170-172 ; Mazzini and the secret societies of Italy, 172, 173 ; the Emperor Napoleon and masonry, 174, 175 ; the Encyclical *Quantà Curâ*, 175 ; general conclusions, 176.

GALILEO, APPENDIX TO THE OCTOBER ARTICLE ON, 260-267 : The objection that no Papal declaration is *ex cathedra*, unless it expresses or implies an anathema, 260, 261 ; difference of the present controversy from that between Gallicans and Ultramontanes, 261, 262 ; answers to the general objection, 262-264 ; Mr. Healy Thompson's letter on the doctrinal decrees of Pontifical Congregations, 264 ; answer to his comments on the case of Galileo, 265-267.

GALLWEY (Rev. Father, S.J.), The Lady Chapel, *noticed*, 546.

Geneva, Catholicism in, 325.

Gibbon (Edward), character of his history, 449.

Gilbert (J. T.), History of the Viceroy of Ireland, *reviewed*, 36.

Gladstone (Right Hon. W. E.), Speech on the Address, 495.

Gregorii Thaumaturgi (S.), Oratio Panegyrica in Origenem, *reviewed*, 377.

Guillemet (Julie), of the Faithful Companions, 71.

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, *reviewed*, 485.

Hexapla, character of the, 380.

Heylin on the state of the English Church, 225.

Hittel (John S.), The Resources of California, *reviewed*, 1.

Houet (Madame d') Vie de, *reviewed*, 59.

IRONS (Rev. W. J.), A Letter addressed to, *noticed*, 548.

Italy, 561-571 ; General abstinence of the voters at the last Italian elections, 561 ; attitude of the different Italian parties, 562 ; conviction of the people that voting is useless, 563 ; analysis of the returns in the principal cities, 564 ; administrative incapacity of the Government, 565 ; disaffection of the Mazzinian party, 565 ; financial difficulties, 566 ; the negotiations with Rome, 567 ; confiscation of the Monastic property, 568 ; the Convention of September, 569, 570 ; policy of the Roman National Committee, 571.

KETTLER (Freiherrn von, Bischof von Mainz), Kann ein gläubiger Christ Freimaurer sein ? *reviewed*, 137.

Kilkenny, Statute of, 51.

LAYMAN (A), Anglo-Romanism Unveiled, *noticed*, 548.

Lockhart (Rev. W.), Correspondence regarding article on Freemasonry, 589.

MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH, 417-434.

Mahon de Monaghan (Eugene), Rome et la Civilisation, *reviewed*, 297.

Manning (Henry Edward, D.D.), the Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England, *reviewed*, 188.



- MARSHALL (T. W. M.), *Christian Missions*, reviewed, 1.  
 Martin (Abbé F.) *Vie de Madame de Bonnault d'Houet*, reviewed, 59.  
 Martin et Fleury (Abbés), *Histoire de M. Vuarin*, reviewed, 325.  
 Melia (Rev. Raphael), *Treatise on Auricular Confession*, noticed, 555.  
 Merivale (Rev. C.), *History of the Romans under the Empire*, 449.  
 Migne (J. P.), *Origenis Opera Omnia*, reviewed, 377.  
 Mill (J. Stuart, M.P.), *Principles of Political Economy*, 356, 373.  
 Missionary College, chiefly for Pagan nations, noticed, 559.  
 Month (The), noticed, 291.
- NEALE (Rev. J. M.), *Edition of the Russian History of the Council of Florence*, reviewed, 496.  
 Newman, (J. H., D.D., of the Oratory), *Letter to the Weekly Register*: note, 196; on *Anglican Difficulties*, 222, 223; a *Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D.*, noticed, 544.
- OAKELEY (Very Rev. Frederick), *The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's late Work*, reviewed, 412.  
 O'Brien (Dr., Protestant Bishop of Ossory), *Ten Sermons*, 224.  
 Origen.—*The Christian Schools of Alexandria*, 377.  
 Ormond (Marquess of), his character, 114.  
 Orsi, controversy with Bossuet, 522, 524, 532, 534.  
 Oxenham (H. N., M.A.), *Dishonest Criticism*, noticed, 274.
- PARLIAMENT, THE NEW, 177-187: Probable effect of Lord Palmerston's death on the new Parliament, 177; effect of the death of King Leopold on foreign affairs, 178; position of Mr. Gladstone in the Government, and of the Government in Parliament, 179; relations of Mr. Lowe, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Bright, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Forster, Mr. Goschen, to the Government, 180; character of the Irish Secretary, Mr. Fortescue, 180, 181; strength of the opposition in the Commons, 181; position of the Government in the House of Lords, 182; query, is Lord Palmerston's majority a majority for Mr. Gladstone, 182; Irish and Catholic interests, 183; new members, 184; the Land Question, 184, 185; proper policy of the Irish members, 186; our relation to Liberals and Conservatives respectively, 187.
- Perin (Charles), *De la Richesse dans les Sociétés Chrétiennes*, reviewed, 348.  
 Perrons (F., S.J.), *Prælectiones*, noticed, 268.  
 Popoff (Basil), *History of the Council of Florence*, reviewed, 496.  
 Population of France, note, 364.  
 Poynings' Law, 54.  
 Prendergast (John P.), *Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*, reviewed, 107.  
 Puritan generals, 122.
- PUSEY'S (Dr.) APOLOGY FOR ANGLICANISM, 188-239: Dr. Pusey's present position like that of Rip Van Winkle, 188, 189; his attitude towards Rome on the whole unaltered, 190; his mistakes, misapprehensions, and misquotations, 190-195; general purport of Archbishop Manning's and of Dr. Pusey's arguments, 196; propositions touching the Rule of Faith,

196, 197; the one Catholic Rule of Faith, 197; F. Newman's view (when an Anglican) of the Rule of Faith, 198; absence before the Christian period of any authoritative standard of religion or morality, 199; remedy provided by the Gospel, 199, 200; method of its operation, 200, 201; action of the Apostles in and on the Church, 202; Rule of Faith in Apostolic times, 202, 203; argument on the new order of things introduced at the death of the Apostles, 203; absence of any trace of a new Rule of Faith, 204; Catholic tradition as to the Rule of Faith, 205, 206; the Apostolic depositum inseparable from the living witness of the Church, 207; Rev. Mr. Penny's argument in regard to the "commonitorium" of Vincent of Lerins, 208, 209; Dr. Pusey's own testimony in his Sermon on the Rule of Faith, 209, 210; the Rule of Faith properly understood involves the Church's Infallibility, 211; and thence its Unity, 211, 212; the Apostolic and Catholic Church one Hierarchical Society, 213; Dr. Pusey's view of ecclesiastical unity, 214; the patristic doctrine of visible unity, 215; the views of F. Newman and Mr. Allies when Anglicans, on Unity, 216; intrinsic character and practical consequences of Dr. Pusey's tenet on ecclesiastical unity, 217-220; the broad contradictions of Roman and Anglican doctrine, 220; inquiry how far has the English Church retained the truths taught by the earlier councils, 221; the Anglican catena of theologians, 222, 223; the Church of England in relation to the heresies of the 16th century, 223; Luther's tenet on Justification held by Anglican Evangelicals, 224; the Bishop of Ossory's argument thereupon, 224, 225; existence of Calvinism in the Church of England, 225-227; divergencies of Anglicanism as to Faith and Works, 227, 228; utter absence of a doctrinal standard among Anglicans, 228, 229; the relation of Faith to the individual, and of unity of doctrine to the Church, 229, 230; Archbishop Manning on the organisation and office of the Church, 230-232; the Archbishop's original argument in his letter to Dr. Pusey, and Dr. Pusey's reply examined, 232-236; the questions of Papal Supremacy and Marian Devotion, and the Church's teaching thereon, 236, 237; impossibility of union unless it be based on union in Faith, 238.

**PUSEY'S (DR.) PROJECT OF UNION, 412-449:** First impressions produced by Dr. Pusey's book, 412; pamphlets elicited by it, F. Newman's, F. Gallwey's, Canon Oakeley's, 413; the Archbishop's Pastoral Letters, 413, 414; proper basis of Union, latitudinarian or dogmatic, 414, 415; two classes of Anglicans in favour of Union, 415, 416; Dr. Pusey's real position, 416; three pervasive misconceptions into which he falls; (1) as to the precept of submission to a central authority, 417; (2) his denial of the Church's infallibility in her magisterium, 417-420; general principles on the Church's infallibility in her magisterium, 421, 422; its trustworthiness, infallibility, and qualifications, 422, 423; Dr. Pusey's recognition of this "practical teaching," 423; proof that the Church is infallible not only in her decrees, but in her magisterium, 424; origin and object of infallibility, 425; the theological magisterium, 426, 427; the popular magisterium, 427, 428; the *sensus fidelium*, 429, 430; theological censure applicable to a rejection of the Church's practical

teaching, 431 ; relation of the Church's popular teaching and formal decrees, 432-434 ; summary of doctrines authoritatively taught regarding our Lady, 434 ; other cognate propositions generally held by pious Catholics, 435 ; the case of a candidate for admission into the Church in regard to her practical teaching, 435, 436 ; the particular position of Dr. Pusey, 437-440 ; Canon Oakeley on the Catholic minimum and Anglican maximum, 440-442 ; (3) Dr. Pusey's misconception as to the admissibility of stipulations for union, 444, 445 ; objection as to the prudence of advocating certain tenets tending to inflame differences and exasperate spirits, 445-447 ; objection as to certain disciplinary concessions made to Eastern schismatics, 447, 448 ; summing up, 449.

Pusey (Rev. E. B., D.D.), *The Church of England a Portion of Christ's one Holy Catholic Church*, reviewed, 188.

— *An Eirenicon*, reviewed, 412.

— *Letters to the Weekly Register*, reviewed, 412.

RATHMINES, BATTLE OF, 119.

Rawlinson (George), *The Five Great Monarchies of the Eastern World*, noticed, 293.

Robison (John), *Proofs of a Conspiracy against Religion and Government* reviewed, 137.

ROME THE CIVILIZER OF NATIONS, 297-325 : Character of MM. Veuillot's and Mahon de Monaghan's works on Rome, 297 ; first impressions of a Catholic at Rome, 297, 298 ; two-fold character of Christian Rome, 298 ; its relation to civilization, 299 ; Religion and Science, 300 ; indirect influence of Rome, 301 ; physical science, 302 ; the Papacy in the fourth century, 303 ; in the fifth, 304, 305 ; in the seventh, 305, 306 ; conflict of the Papacy with Islamism, 307-309 ; Rome and the Feudal System, 309, 310 ; cities and governments of the Middle Ages, 310, 311 ; Slavery, 311, 312 ; the Pope and other Sovereigns, 312, 313 ; the contest with the Emperors of Germany, 313 ; influence of theology on law, 314 ; policy of Gregory VII., 315 ; influence of the Reformation on Rome, 316 ; missions to Africa, Asia, America, 317 ; the Religious Orders, 317, 318 ; Catholic Universities, 318, 319 ; the case of Galileo, 320 ; the Popes in relation to letters, 321 ; eminent Catholic men of letters, 322, 323 ; the Cross the true vivifying principle of civilization, 324, 325.

Rosmini and the Congregation of the Index, 590.

Roscher, *Principes d'Economie Politique*, 350.

Rossi, *Economie Politique*, 350, 370.

SATURDAY REVIEW, Criticism on Count de Champagne, 452

Septuagint, Origin of the, 377.

Serra (Father Junipero), his Californian mission, 1-5.

SIGNS OF AN IRISH POLICY, 485-496 : Quotation from the article, "Wanted a Policy for Ireland" (April, 1865), 485, 486 ; state of Irish affairs at that time, 486 ; contrast of present circumstances, the Fenian conspiracy, 486-488 ; indications, nevertheless, of a comprehensive Irish policy, 488 ; the Land Question, 489 ; the Government Bill, and further sug-

gestions for legislation, 489-491 ; the *Times*' suggestion of a Farmers' Strike, 491 ; Catholic Interests, 491, 492 ; University Education, 492 ; the endowment of the Catholic Clergy, 493 ; questions affecting loyalty, the removal of the Viceroyalty, visits of the Queen to Ireland, extension of the Volunteer movement to Ireland, 493-495 ; Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Address, 495, 496.

Sismondi, *Nouveaux Principes d'Economie Politique*, 350.

Smiles (Samuel), *Lives of Boulton and Watt*, *noticed*, 294.

Spain, 571-576: *Tactique of the Revolutionary Party in Spain*, 572 ; the *Progresista Manifesto*, 573, 574 ; intended revolutionary demonstration on the Queen's return to Madrid, 574 ; O'Donnell's military arrangements, 575 ; Espartero and Prim, 575 ; the Cholera in Madrid, 576 ; the destiny of Spain, 576.

TERESA (Saint), *The Life of*, *noticed*, 289.

Tetrapla, *Character of the*, 383.

Thompson (E. Healy), *Letter to the Tablet*, 264.

ULLATHORNE (Bishop), *on the Management of Prisoners*, *noticed*, 542.

*Union Review (The)*, *noticed*, 281.

VERE (AUBREY DE), *Letters on the endowment of the Irish Clergy*, 493.

Veuillot (Louis), *Le Parfum de Rome*, *reviewed*, 297.

VICEROYS (THE), OF IRELAND, 36-59 ; general character of Irish history, 36 ; Mr. Gilbert's method and style, 37 ; the rank and title of the early Viceroys, 38 ; the Viceroys under Henry II. and John, 39, 40 ; the conflict between de Courcy and de Lacy, 40, 43 ; emoluments of the viceroyalty, 43 ; the Dublin exchequer, 44, 45 ; geography of the Pale, 46, 47 ; tributes to the native Princes, 48, 49 ; legal banishment to Ireland, 50 ; the statute of Kilkenny, 51-53 ; Poynings' law, 54-57 ; the Parliament of 1498, 57, 58 ; the case of Alice de Ketteler, 59.

Volunteer Movement, its extension to Ireland advocated, 493.

WARD (Dr.), *on Doctrinal Decisions which are not Articles of Faith*, 560.

*Weekly Register*, Dr. Pusey's Letters to the ; note, 188.

Westminster (Archbishop of), *the Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*. *reviewed*, 188 ; *the Reunion of Christendom*, *reviewed*, 412.

Wolowski, *Memoire sur l'Administration de Henri IV.*, 371.

